

A High-Precision Variational Approach to Three- and Four-Nucleon Bound and Zero-Energy Scattering States

A. Kievsky¹, S. Rosati^{2,1}, M. Viviani¹, L.E. Marcucci^{2,1}, and L. Girlanda¹

¹ Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 3, I-56127, Pisa, Italy

² Department of Physics “E. Fermi”, University of Pisa, Largo B. Pontecorvo 3, I-56127, Pisa, Italy

E-mail: sergio.rosati@df.unipi.it.

Abstract.

The hyperspherical harmonic (HH) method has been widely applied in recent times to the study of the bound states, using the Rayleigh-Ritz variational principle, and of low-energy scattering processes, using the Kohn variational principle, of $A = 3$ and 4 nuclear systems. When the wave function of the system is expanded over a sufficiently large set of HH basis functions, containing or not correlation factors, quite accurate results can be obtained for the observables of interest. In this paper, the main aspects of the method are discussed together with its application to the $A = 3$ and 4 nuclear bound and zero-energy scattering states. Results for a variety of nucleon-nucleon (NN) and three-nucleon (3N) local or non-local interactions are reported. In particular, NN and 3N interactions derived in the framework of the chiral effective field theory and NN potentials from which the high momentum components have been removed, as recently presented in the literature, are considered for the first time within the context of the HH method. The purpose of this paper is two-fold. First, to present a complete description of the HH method for bound and scattering states, including also detailed formulas for the computation of the matrix elements of the NN and 3N interactions. Second, to report accurate results for bound and zero-energy scattering states obtained with the most commonly used interaction models. These results can be useful for comparison with those obtained by other techniques and are a significant test for different future approaches to such problems.

1. Introduction

The study of nuclear physics started just in the first few years after the introduction of quantum mechanics. From the very beginning, the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation was introduced, written as

$$H\Psi = (T + V)\Psi = E\Psi . \quad (1)$$

Here E and Ψ are the energy and the wave function of the considered nuclear system, and H is the Hamiltonian operator, given as the sum of the kinetic (T) and potential (V) energy operators. Correspondingly, two important and difficult problems immediately were raised: the first one was the determination of the nuclear interaction, i.e. the potential energy operator, the second was the solution of Eq. (1) to calculate the wave function Ψ . These two aspects are reviewed in the following sections.

1.1. The Nuclear Interaction

Significant progress on the problem of determining the nuclear interaction was made after the fundamental paper of Yukawa [1] and the subsequent experimental discovery of the pion. However, the very first field theoretical approaches focusing on pion-exchanges [2, 3] were not successful, due to the non-renormalizability of meson field theory. As a consequence, semi-phenomenological approaches were then pursued. They were based on the assumption that the nuclear interaction is mainly a nucleon-nucleon (NN) interaction, whose long-range part can be described as due to a one-pion exchange (OPE). For the medium- and shorter-range parts, empirical forms were used, with the inclusion, in some cases, of a hard-core repulsion [4, 5].

The discovery of heavy mesons gave rise to other attempts to describe the NN interaction as due to a OPE, heavy meson and multi-meson exchanges, with the short-range part still treated in a phenomenological way. Moreover, a vast theoretical effort was made to calculate the two-pion exchange contribution producing the intermediate range attraction of the NN force. The Paris [6], the Nijmegen [7] and the Bonn [8] models are the most representative ones of such effort.

In recent times, accurate calculations on few-nucleon systems have clearly indicated that, to perform a meaningful comparison with the experimental data, the input NN potential must reproduce, with a χ^2/datum close to unity, the deuteron binding energy and NN scattering data up to the pion threshold, namely $E_{\text{lab}} \lesssim 350 \text{ MeV}$, E_{lab} being the NN laboratory kinetic energy [9, 10, 11]. Consequently, a new generation of interaction models, as the so-called Nijmegen [9], Argonne v_{18} (AV18) [10], and charge-dependent Bonn (CDBonn) [11] potentials, has been derived. These models explicitly include charge symmetry breaking (CSB) terms in the nuclear interaction in order to reproduce equally well the np and the pp data. Furthermore, they can be local, as the first two models, or non-local, as the last one. However, it has been shown that none of these models reproduces the $A > 2$ dynamics in a satisfactory way. For example, they strongly underpredict the $A > 2$ binding energies. A possible cure is the inclusion of three-nucleon (3N) interaction terms in the potential energy operator. The very first model for a 3N interaction was proposed by Fujita and Miyazawa [12] and was again based on meson theory. In fact, the 3N interaction was derived from the exchange of two pions between three nucleons, with the intermediate excitation of a Δ resonance. This two-pion-exchange 3N interaction mechanism is the starting point of the 3N interaction models derived by the Urbana group [13, 14]. The Urbana models are written as the sum

of the two-pion-exchange 3N interaction plus a phenomenological repulsive term. The strengths of the two contributions are adjusted to reproduce the triton binding energy and the nuclear matter equilibrium density, in conjunction with one of the Argonne NN potentials. In particular, the so-called Urbana IX 3N interaction [14] is often used with the Argonne AV18 NN interaction. A more recent and sophisticated 3N interaction model [15], still derived by the Urbana group, contains two-pion-exchange terms due to pion-nucleon scattering in S - and P -waves, three-pion-exchange terms due to ring diagrams with one Δ resonance in the intermediate states, and again a phenomenological repulsive term. The model has five parameters which are fitted to the light nuclei mass spectrum. This more recent model has a rather complicated operatorial structure and is currently object of study.

Another family of models for the 3N interaction is known as the Tucson-Melbourne [16] (TM) potential, which arises from an off-mass-shell model for the pion-nucleon scattering based upon current algebra and a dispersion-theoretical axial vector amplitude dominated by the Δ resonance. The model contains monopole form factors, whose cutoff is adjusted to reproduce the triton binding energy. More recently, the model has been revisited within a chiral symmetry approach [17], and it has been demonstrated that the contact term present in the TM model should be dropped. This new TM potential, known as TM', has been subsequently readjusted [18]. The final operatorial structure coincides with that one given in the 3N Brazil interaction already derived many years ago [19].

The main difficulty associated with the aforementioned approach is the following. The potential models considered fit the experimental NN scattering data up to $E_{\text{lab}} \lesssim 350$ MeV, and the $A = 3$ nuclei binding energies, but they treat each one in its peculiar way the higher momentum contributions. More in general, the problem is the connection between these NN plus 3N potentials and the fundamental theory of strong interactions, namely quantum chromodynamics (QCD). The approach of Weinberg [20, 21], when applied to low-energy processes, suggests how the problem can be overcome, at least partially. The starting point is to consider the most general Lagrangian that incorporates the assumed symmetry principles, in particular the (broken) chiral symmetry of QCD, constructed in terms of the pion and nucleon fields, which are the effective degrees of freedom at low energy, and their covariant derivatives. The old-fashioned perturbation theory can be applied to NN scattering, resulting in an infinite number of Feynman diagrams. Weinberg has shown [21] that a systematic expansion of the nuclear potential can be made in terms of $(Q/\Lambda)^\nu$, Q being the pion momentum, $\Lambda \approx 1$ GeV the chiral breaking scale and ν a non-negative integer number. For each value of ν , i.e. the order of the expansion, the number of corresponding Feynman diagrams is finite and can be calculated. Such an approach is model independent and is known as the chiral perturbation theory (χ PT). Following the first approach of Weinberg, a number of NN potentials has been obtained by many authors [22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28] increasing the order of the expansion. For $\nu = 1, 2, \dots$ the notation NLO, next-to leading order, N2LO, next-to-next, and so on, is commonly used.

It is important to notice that χ PT makes specific predictions for many-nucleon forces, too. Three-body forces, for instance, appear for $\nu \geq 2$, i.e. firstly at N2LO. This explains why the contributions of the 3N interaction to the description of the $A > 2$ dynamics are rather small if compared with the ones arising from the NN interaction.

More recently a new class of NN interactions has been obtained. With the purpose of eliminating from the semi-phenomenological high precision potentials the strong high momentum parts, the Hilbert space is separated into low and high momentum regions and the renormalization group method [29] is used to integrate out the high-momentum components above a cutoff Λ . In this way a model independent potential V_{low-k} can be obtained [30, 31, 32, 33, 34]. An important issue of this procedure is what value should be used for Λ . As already discussed in Refs. [30, 35], Λ should be large enough to include all the relevant degrees of freedom. For instance, if $\Lambda < 2m_\pi$, m_π being the pion mass, the two-pion exchange part of the bare NN interaction is integrated out. As a consequence, the model-dependence of triton binding energy is remarkably reduced [35]. On the other hand, such model-dependence becomes very strong for $\Lambda > 2.0 - 2.5 \text{ fm}^{-1}$, where the differences between the various semi-phenomenological NN potentials in their short-distance structure start to be important.

1.2. Calculations on Three- and Four-Nucleon Systems

Different methods can be used to study few-body bound and scattering states. In nuclear physics many calculations have been made on systems with $A = 3$ and 4 by solving the Schrödinger equation using various NN local or non-local interactions with and without the inclusion of 3N forces. For $A = 3$, the Faddeev equations [36] (FE) technique has been widely applied both in coordinate and in momentum space. A detailed discussion of the method and the results for bound and scattering states can be found in Ref. [37]. The Faddeev-Yakubovsky (FY) equations [38] are the generalization of the Faddeev equations to the $A = 4$ case. They can be solved in configuration space [39] as well as in momentum space [40, 41, 42].

Alternative approaches to the FE and FY equations techniques make use of variational principles. Among them we can mention the Rayleigh-Ritz variational principle used for studying bound states and the Kohn variational principle [43] used in the case of scattering states. A few of the most important variational approaches for studying few-nucleon systems are briefly recalled here.

The quantum Monte Carlo variational methods have been applied in two different ways. In the first one, known as the variational Monte Carlo, flexible functions containing a number of trial parameters are conveniently chosen. The mean value of the Hamiltonian is calculated by a Monte Carlo technique and the parameters are varied so as to obtain the minimum mean value [44]. The second approach is the so-called Green's function Monte Carlo method. It is based on a sophisticated algorithm for evaluating appropriate path integrals in order to obtain the properties of the bound states of the Hamiltonian [45, 46]. Further refinements of the algorithm have made it possible to

push the calculation up to $A = 10$ [47].

The coupled-rearrangement-channel Gaussian (CRCG) basis proposed by Kamimura [48] has been applied successfully to various systems, in particular to $A = 3$ and 4 nuclei [49]. A further development of this approach is the so-called stochastic variational method (SVM) in which the Gaussian-type basis is optimized by means of a stochastic procedure [50, 51].

The no-core shell model (NCSM) is an approach which has been successfully applied both to s-shell and p-shell nuclei [52, 53, 54, 55, 56]. The calculation is done with a finite harmonic-oscillator basis. In the model space spanned by these states, an A -body operator is approximated to a two(three)-body effective interaction, by applying the Suzuki-Lee method [57], and therefore an effective Hamiltonian is constructed. By extending the basis, the NCSM calculation should converge to the exact solution.

The hyperspherical harmonic (HH) method has a rather long history. In principle the HH basis functions can be used for expanding the wave function of a generic A -body system [58, 59]. The problem with such a basis is its quite large degeneracy which increases very rapidly with A and makes necessary the inclusion of a very high number of basis elements in the expansion. Exceptions to this general rule arise when the system interacts through very soft interactions or when the interaction has an hyperradial character as the harmonic oscillator potential. However, this is not the case of the strong state-dependent nuclear potential making the application of the HH technique to nuclear systems a difficult task. One possibility to tackle this problem is to introduce an effective interaction in the Hilbert space spanned by the finite basis considered [60], as has been done in the applications of the NCSM mentioned above.

During the last few years, the authors of this paper started a strong collaboration in the application of the HH technique to describe bound states of light nuclear systems and to low-energy scattering processes involving few nucleons. In the first approaches, initiated by some of the authors, the HH functions were multiplied by suitable correlation factors in order to strongly improve the convergence of the basis [61, 62, 63]. Subsequently, thanks to the improvement in the computational facilities, it has been possible to consider very large sets of basis functions in order to accurately describe all the details of the wave function of the system [64, 65]. A significant test of the accuracy reached in the calculation of the wave function of the α -particle bound state using the HH expansion is given in Ref. [66]. In that work, the HH results for the binding energy and other quantities of interest are compared to those ones obtained by the methods quoted above. In the production of this benchmark, the Argonne v_8' (AV8') NN potential [45] has been used. Very recently, the HH technique has been further developed making it possible to use for the first time non-local potentials in the description of the $A = 3, 4$ systems [67, 68].

The HH method is a powerful tool for investigating scattering processes in the $A = 3$ [69, 70, 71] and 4 [72] systems. The scattering wave function is expanded in the HH basis taking into account explicitly its asymptotic part describing the relative motion of the incident nucleon and the target. The Kohn variational principle [43] is then used

to calculate the S -matrix of the reaction from which the observables of interest can be computed. To be noticed that in the application to scattering states the electromagnetic long range potential has to be taken into account properly. A discussion of this subject can be found in Refs. [73, 74]. Furthermore, different benchmarks have been done in which the nd and pd phases calculated using the HH expansion are compared to those obtained using the FE technique [75, 76]. As a further application, the scattering wave functions obtained from the HH expansion can be used to describe electroweak few-nucleon reactions. It should be remarked that at small energies, as those ones involved in astrophysical processes, the HH technique is the only one presently available that is capable of yielding precise predictions for a few astrophysical reactions [77, 78, 79, 80].

The present paper is organized in the following way: in Sec. 2 the Jacobi coordinate systems are introduced, together with the hyperspherical variables. In Sec. 3 the hyperspherical harmonic functions are defined and their properties are briefly reviewed. In Sec. 4, the practical implementation of the HH expansion for the $A = 3$ and 4 bound states is described. In particular, the two “standard” approaches known as HH and correlated-HH (CHH) expansions are discussed. In Sec. 5, the HH method devised for the study of low-energy scattering states is briefly reviewed. In Sec. 6 a large variety of results obtained applying the HH method to the $A = 3$ and 4 bound and scattering states is presented and compared with those obtained by other techniques and the available experimental data. Some concluding remarks, with an outlook on the future of this technique, are presented in Sec. 7. Finally, a few details of the calculations are given in the Appendices.

2. Jacobi Coordinates and Hyperspherical Variables

Let us consider a generic isolated system of A particles with spatial coordinates $\mathbf{r}_i$ and masses m_i , $i = 1, \dots, A$. In the center-of-mass reference frame, $N = A - 1$ vectors are sufficient to specify the spatial configuration of the system. They can be taken as linear combinations of the $\mathbf{r}_i$ and there is considerable freedom in choosing the corresponding coefficients. Let us introduce the Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, which, by definition, are such that the total kinetic energy operator can be written in the form

$$T = - \sum_{i=1}^A \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_i} \nabla_i^2 = - \frac{\hbar^2}{m} \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i}^2 - \frac{\hbar^2}{2M} \nabla_{\mathbf{X}}^2, \quad (2)$$

where m is a reference mass, $M = \sum_{i=1}^A m_i$ is the total mass of the system, and $\mathbf{X} = (1/M) \sum_{i=1}^A m_i \mathbf{r}_i$ is the center-of-mass coordinate. In general, various choices of the Jacobi coordinates are possible. One commonly used is the following

$$\mathbf{x}_{N-j+1} = \sqrt{\frac{2m_{j+1}M_j}{(m_{j+1} + M_j)m}} [\mathbf{r}_{j+1} - \mathbf{X}_j], \quad j = 1, \dots, N, \quad (3)$$

where

$$M_j = \sum_{i=1}^j m_i, \quad \mathbf{X}_j = \frac{1}{M_j} \sum_{i=1}^j m_i \mathbf{r}_i, \quad (4)$$

i.e. $\mathbf{X}_j$ is the coordinate of the center-of-mass of particles $1, \dots, j$. In this paper we will be interested in cases where all the particles have equal mass m and correspondingly Eq. (3) takes the form

$$\mathbf{x}_{N-j+1} = \sqrt{\frac{2j}{j+1}} [\mathbf{r}_{j+1} - \mathbf{X}_j], \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (5)$$

For $A = 3$, the above definition of the Jacobi coordinates, once a permutation of $(1, 2, 3)$ has been fixed, is unique. For $A = 4$ two different choices of Jacobi vectors exist, specifically

$$\begin{aligned} \text{set } A & & \text{set } B \\ \mathbf{x}_{1A} &= \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} (\mathbf{r}_m - \frac{\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{r}_j + \mathbf{r}_k}{3}), & \mathbf{x}_{1B} &= \mathbf{r}_m - \mathbf{r}_k, \\ \mathbf{x}_{2A} &= \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}} (\mathbf{r}_k - \frac{\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{r}_j}{2}), & \mathbf{x}_{2B} &= \sqrt{2} (\frac{\mathbf{r}_m + \mathbf{r}_k}{2} - \frac{\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{r}_j}{2}), \\ \mathbf{x}_{3A} &= \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i, & \mathbf{x}_{3B} &= \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_i, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where (i, j, k, m) is a generic permutation of $(1, 2, 3, 4)$. In the following, the wave function of the system will be expanded into a complete basis. The basis elements can be defined using set A or set B of the Jacobi coordinates. The completeness of the basis assures that the expansions using one set or the other are completely equivalent. In numerical applications the expansion is truncated and this equivalence does not hold anymore. Therefore it could be convenient to include basis elements defined both in set A and set B . As an important example, let us consider the ground state of the α -particle. The set A of coordinates in Eq. (6) can be more adequate for constructing contributions to the wave function corresponding to a $\{3+1\}$ cluster structure, namely ${}^3\text{He} + n$ or ${}^3\text{H} + p$. Set B , instead, is more suitable for contributions coming from the $\{2+2\}$ configuration, such as a $d+d$ cluster structure. Therefore the use of an expansion basis constructed using both coordinate sets can speed up the convergence [49, 63].

For a given choice of the Jacobi vectors, the hyperspherical coordinates are given by the so-called hyperradius ρ , which results to be independent of the permutation order of the particles and is defined as

$$\rho^2 = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i^2 = \frac{2}{A} \sum_{i < j} (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j)^2 = 2 \sum_{i=1}^A (\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{X})^2, \quad (7)$$

and by a set Ω_N of angular variables. In the Zernike and Brinkman [58, 81] representation, they are $2N$ polar angles $\hat{x}_i \equiv (\theta_i, \phi_i)$ of the Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, and $N-1$ hyperspherical angles φ_i , with $0 \leq \varphi_i \leq \pi/2$, given by the relation

$$\cos \varphi_i = \frac{x_i}{\sqrt{x_1^2 + \dots + x_i^2}}, \quad i = 2, \dots, N, \quad (8)$$

where x_i is the modulus of the Jacobi vector $\mathbf{x}_i$. Therefore, we have

$$\Omega_N \equiv \{\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_N, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_N\}. \quad (9)$$

3. Hyperspherical Harmonic Functions

The spherical harmonic functions $Y_{\ell,m}(\theta, \phi)$ are a very familiar tool in the study of quantum mechanical problems in a three-dimensional space. It is well known that $r^\ell Y_{\ell,m}(\theta, \phi)$ is a harmonic polynomial of order ℓ in the Cartesian components x, y, z of the vector $\mathbf{r}$, a harmonic polynomial being defined to be a homogeneous polynomial satisfying the three-dimensional Laplace equation. The spherical harmonic functions form an irreducible representation of the $SO(3)$ group. The hyperspherical harmonic functions are the generalization to the case of $D = 3N$ dimensional space. To this end, it is convenient to consider a homogeneous polynomial $h_{[G]}$ of degree G in the Cartesian coordinates of N Jacobi vectors and then introduce

$$Y_{[G]} = h_{[G]}/\rho^G, \quad (10)$$

where ρ is the hyperradius as given in Eq. (7). Since $h_{[G]}$ is a homogeneous polynomial, $h_{[G]}/\rho^G$ does not depend anymore on ρ and therefore is a function only of the variables Ω_N specified in Eq. (9). Moreover, the $3N$ -dimensional Laplace operator Δ can be written in the form

$$\Delta = \sum_{i=1}^N \nabla_{\mathbf{x}_i}^2 = \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{3N-1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + \frac{\Lambda_N^2(\Omega_N)}{\rho^2} \right), \quad (11)$$

where Λ_N^2 is the $3N$ -dimensional generalized angular momentum operator depending only on the hyperangles Ω_N . By definition $\Delta h_{[G]} = 0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta h_{[G]} &= \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{3N-1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + \frac{\Lambda_N^2(\Omega_N)}{\rho^2} \right) \rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) \\ &= \left(\Lambda_N^2(\Omega_N) + G(G + D - 2) \right) \rho^{G-2} Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and dividing by ρ^{G-2} we get

$$\left(\Lambda_N^2(\Omega_N) + G(G + D - 2) \right) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) = 0. \quad (13)$$

A function satisfying the latter equation is an eigenfunction of the generalized angular momentum operator and is known as a hyperspherical harmonic function. The operator Λ_N^2 is sometimes called the grand angular momentum operator, and G the grand angular momentum quantum number. $[G]$ stands for a set of quantum numbers as it will be specified in the following. The grand angular momentum operator can be written in the form [58]

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda_i^2(\Omega_i) &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \varphi_i^2} + \left[3(i-2) \cotan \varphi_i + 2(\cotan \varphi_i - \tan \varphi_i) \right] \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi_i} \\ &\quad + \frac{L_i^2}{\cos^2 \varphi_i} + \frac{\Lambda_{i-1}^2(\Omega_{i-1})}{\sin^2 \varphi_i}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $-L_i^2$ is the angular momentum operator associated with the i -th Jacobi vector. In particular

$$\Lambda_1^2(\Omega_1) = L_1^2. \quad (15)$$

The solutions of Eq. (13) can be constructed by following a recursive procedure [81]. In the case $N = 1$, namely $D = 3$, the eigenfunctions are the spherical harmonic functions $Y_{\ell_1 m_1}(\hat{x}_1)$.

For $N = 2$, the equation to be solved is

$$\Lambda_2(\Omega_2)Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2) = -G(G+4)Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2) , \quad \Omega_2 \equiv \{\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \varphi_2\} , \quad (16)$$

with $\Lambda_2(\Omega_2)$ following from Eq. (14). Let us look for a solution of the previous equation of the form

$$Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2) = F(\cos 2\varphi_2)(\cos \varphi_2)^{\ell_2}(\sin \varphi_2)^{\ell_1}Y_{\ell_1 m_1}(\hat{x}_1)Y_{\ell_2 m_2}(\hat{x}_2) , \quad (17)$$

where F is a function to be determined. In terms of the variable $z = \cos 2\varphi_2$, from Eq. (16) one gets

$$(1 - z^2)F'' + (\alpha - \beta z)F' + \gamma F = 0 , \quad (18)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &= \ell_2 - \ell_1 , \quad \beta = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + 3 , \\ \gamma &= \frac{1}{4} [G(G+4) - (\ell_1 + \ell_2)(\ell_1 + \ell_2 + 4)] . \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Eq. (18) is the one satisfied by the Jacobi polynomial $P_n^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}(z)$ provided that $G = 2n + \ell_1 + \ell_2$ [82]. Therefore, a solution of Eq. (16) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2) &= \mathcal{N}_n^{\ell_2, \nu_2} (\cos \varphi_2)^{\ell_2} (\sin \varphi_2)^{\ell_1} Y_{\ell_1 m_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell_2 m_2}(\hat{x}_2) \\ &\times P_n^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_2) , \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_n^{\ell_2, \nu_2}$ is a normalization factor which will be specified later and $\nu_2 = 2n + \ell_1 + \ell_2 + 2$. It is easy to verify that $\rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of order G in the Cartesian components of $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$. In fact, for $N = 2$, one has $x_1 = \rho \sin \varphi_2$ and $x_2 = \rho \cos \varphi_2$, and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2) &= \mathcal{N}_n^{\ell_2, \nu_2} \rho^{2n} x_1^{\ell_1} Y_{\ell_1 m_1}(\hat{x}_1) x_2^{\ell_2} Y_{\ell_2 m_2}(\hat{x}_2) \\ &\times P_n^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_2) . \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Since $P_n^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}$ is a polynomial of degree n in the variable $\cos 2\varphi_2$ and

$$\rho^2 \cos 2\varphi_2 = 2x_2^2 - \rho^2 = x_2^2 - x_1^2 , \quad (22)$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^{2n} P_n^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_2) &= \rho^{2n} \sum_{m=0}^n a_m (\cos 2\varphi_2)^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^n a_m (\rho^2 \cos 2\varphi_2)^m \rho^{2(n-m)} = \sum_{m=0}^n a_m (x_2^2 - x_1^2)^m (x_2^2 + x_1^2)^{n-m} , \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

which is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $2n$. Moreover the two terms in Eq. (21), $x_1^{\ell_1} Y_{\ell_1 m_1}(\hat{x}_1)$ and $x_2^{\ell_2} Y_{\ell_2 m_2}(\hat{x}_2)$, are homogeneous polynomials of degree ℓ_1 and ℓ_2 respectively, so that in conclusion, $\rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_2)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree

$G = 2n + \ell_1 + \ell_2$. In this case the symbol $[G]$ stands for the set of quantum numbers ℓ_1, m_1, ℓ_2, m_2 and n .

From the expression of the grand angular momentum operator Λ_i^2 given in Eq. (14), it is possible to determine the HH functions for a given N in terms of those found for the case $N - 1$. Let us consider the function $Y_{[G_{N-1}]}(\Omega_{N-1})$, satisfying the equation

$$\Lambda_{N-1}^2(\Omega_{N-1})Y_{[G_{N-1}]}(\Omega_{N-1}) = -G_{N-1}(G_{N-1} + D - 5)Y_{[G_{N-1}]}(\Omega_{N-1}) , \quad (24)$$

namely the eigenfunction of Λ_{N-1}^2 whose grand angular momentum quantum number is G_{N-1} , and look for the eigenfunction of Λ_N^2 of the form

$$Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) = (\cos \varphi_N)^{\ell_N} (\sin \varphi_N)^{G_{N-1}} \times Y_{[G_{N-1}]}(\Omega_{N-1}) Y_{\ell_N m_N}(\hat{x}_N) F(\cos 2\varphi_N) . \quad (25)$$

By inserting this expression for $Y_{[G]}$ in the corresponding eigenvalue equation and taking into account Eq. (24), the following solution is found

$$F(\cos 2\varphi_N) = \mathcal{N}_{n_N}^{\ell_N, \nu_N} P_{n_N}^{\nu_{N-1}, \ell_N+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_N) , \quad (26)$$

with

$$G = 2n_N + \ell_N + G_{N-1} , \quad \nu_{N-1} = G_{N-1} + \frac{3(N-1)}{2} - 1 , \\ \nu_N = G + \frac{3N}{2} - 1 . \quad (27)$$

The complete expression of the HH function can therefore be cast in the form [58]

$$Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) = \left[\prod_{j=1}^N Y_{\ell_j, m_j}(\hat{x}_j) \right] \times \left[\prod_{j=2}^N {}^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_{n_j}^{G_{j-1}, \ell_j}(\varphi_j) \right] , \quad (28)$$

where

$${}^{(j)}\mathcal{P}_{n_j}^{G_{j-1}, \ell_j}(\varphi_j) = \mathcal{N}_{n_j}^{\ell_j, \nu_j} (\cos \varphi_j)^{\ell_j} (\sin \varphi_j)^{G_{j-1}} P_{n_j}^{\nu_{j-1}, \ell_j+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_j) , \quad (29)$$

and the quantum numbers G_j and ν_j are defined to be

$$G_j = \sum_{i=1}^j (\ell_i + 2n_i) , \quad n_1 \equiv 0 , \quad G \equiv G_N , \quad \nu_j = G_j + \frac{3j}{2} - 1 . \quad (30)$$

The symbol $[G]$ distinguishes between different HH functions having the same G value. There are $3N - 1$ quantum numbers which specify a HH function: the $2N$ quantum numbers ℓ, m associated with the spherical harmonic functions, and the $N - 1$ quantum numbers n associated with the hyperspherical polynomials. In summary, $[G]$ stands for the following set of quantum numbers

$$[G] \equiv \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_N, m_1, \dots, m_N, n_2, \dots, n_N\} . \quad (31)$$

The normalization factors $\mathcal{N}$ are chosen so as to verify the orthonormality condition

$$\int d\Omega_N \left(Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) \right)^* Y_{[G']}(\Omega_N) = \delta_{[G], [G']} , \quad (32)$$

where [58]

$$d\Omega_N = \sin \theta_1 d\theta_1 d\phi_1 \prod_{j=2}^N \sin \theta_j d\theta_j d\phi_j (\cos \varphi_j)^2 (\sin \varphi_j)^{3j-4} d\varphi_j, \quad (33)$$

is the surface element on the hypersphere of unit hyperradius. Their explicit expression is

$$\mathcal{N}_{n_j}^{\ell_j, \nu_j} = \left[\frac{2\nu_j \Gamma(\nu_j - n_j) n_j!}{\Gamma(\nu_j - n_j - \ell_j - \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(n_j + \ell_j + \frac{3}{2})} \right]^{1/2}. \quad (34)$$

Again, by using the definition of the hyperspherical angles in Eq. (8), it can be easily shown that the functions $\rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N)$ are homogeneous polynomials. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^G Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) &\propto \left[\prod_{j=1}^N x_j^{\ell_j} Y_{\ell_j, m_j}(\hat{x}_j) \right] \\ &\times \left[\prod_{j=2}^N \rho^{2n_j} (\sin \varphi_{j+1} \cdots \sin \varphi_N)^{2n_j} P_{n_j}(\cos 2\varphi_j) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

The first factor is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $\ell_1 + \cdots + \ell_N$. Moreover,

$$\rho^2 \cos 2\varphi_j = \frac{x_j^2 - (x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{j-1}^2)}{(\sin \varphi_{j+1} \cdots \sin \varphi_N)^2}, \quad (36)$$

and

$$(\rho \sin \varphi_{j+1} \cdots \sin \varphi_N)^2 = x_1^2 + \cdots + x_j^2. \quad (37)$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &(\rho \sin \varphi_{j+1} \cdots \sin \varphi_N)^{2n_j} P_{n_j}(\cos 2\varphi_j) \\ &= \rho^{2n_j} (\sin \varphi_{j+1} \cdots \sin \varphi_N)^{2n_j} \sum_{m=0}^{n_j} a_m (\cos 2\varphi_j)^m \\ &= \sum_{m=0}^{n_j} a_m \left(x_j^2 - (x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{j-1}^2) \right)^m \left(x_1^2 + \cdots + x_j^2 \right)^{n_j-m}, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

is a homogeneous polynomial of order $2n_j$.

The HH functions have several important properties. A few of them will be reported here without proof.

- The expansion of a plane wave in the $3N$ dimensional space is given by [59]

$$e^{i \sum_{i=1, N} \mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_i} = \frac{(2\pi)^{D/2}}{(Q\rho)^{D/2-1}} \sum_{[G]} i^G Y_{[G]}^*(\Omega_N^q) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) J_{G+\frac{D}{2}-1}(Q\rho), \quad (39)$$

where Q and Ω_N^q are the hyperspherical coordinates associated with the N Jacobi conjugate momenta $\mathbf{q}_i$, and $J_\nu(Q\rho)$ are Bessel functions of the first kind. The sum is taken over all the grand angular momentum quantum numbers G and over the corresponding degeneracy, namely the number of different HH functions for each G .

- By introducing the hypercoordinates ρ', Ω'_N associated with the N vectors $\mathbf{x}'_i$ and using the plane wave expansion given in Eq. (39), the following relation is found

$$\sum_{[G]} Y_{[G]}^*(\Omega'_N) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) \frac{\delta(\rho - \rho')}{\rho^{D-1}} = \prod_{i=1}^N \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i) . \quad (40)$$

With the definition

$$\delta^{D-1}(\Omega_N - \Omega'_N) = \prod_{i=1}^N \delta^2(\hat{x}_i - \hat{x}'_i) \prod_{i=2}^N \frac{\delta(\varphi_i - \varphi'_i)}{(\cos \varphi_i)^2 (\sin \varphi_i)^{3i-4}} , \quad (41)$$

we arrive at the relation

$$\sum_{[G]} Y_{[G]}^*(\Omega'_N) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) = \delta^{D-1}(\Omega_N - \Omega'_N) , \quad (42)$$

which assures the completeness of the HH basis. As a consequence, every “regular” function $f(\Omega_N)$ can be expanded in terms of the HH functions. In fact

$$f(\Omega_N) = \int d\Omega'_N \delta^{D-1}(\Omega_N - \Omega'_N) f(\Omega'_N) = \sum_{[G]} a_{[G]} Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) , \quad (43)$$

where

$$a_{[G]} = \int d\Omega'_N Y_{[G]}^*(\Omega'_N) f(\Omega'_N) . \quad (44)$$

- The $3N$ -dimensional Fourier transform of a function $f(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} \int d^3\mathbf{x}_1 \cdots d^3\mathbf{x}_N f(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) \\ &\quad \times e^{i \sum_{i=1, N} \mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_i} , \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

and the inverse transform is

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) &= \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{D/2}} \int d^3\mathbf{q}_1 \cdots d^3\mathbf{q}_N \tilde{f}(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N) \\ &\quad \times e^{-i \sum_{i=1, N} \mathbf{q}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_i} . \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{(2\pi)^D} \int d^3\mathbf{q}_1 \cdots d^3\mathbf{q}_N e^{i \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{q}_i \cdot (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i)} = \prod_{i=1}^N \delta^3(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}'_i) . \quad (47)$$

- From the previous discussion it follows that the spatial wave function of an A -body system can be written in terms of the N Jacobi vectors and in turn expanded in the HH basis

$$\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N) = \sum_{[G]} u_{[G]}(\rho) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) , \quad (48)$$

where the expansion coefficients are now functions of the hyperradius. The same expansion can be expressed as well in terms of the momentum space coordinates:

$$\tilde{\Psi}(\mathbf{q}_1, \dots, \mathbf{q}_N) = \sum_{[G]} g_{[G]}(Q) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N^q) . \quad (49)$$

The two expansions are equivalent provided that

$$g_{[G]}(Q) = (-i)^G \int_0^\infty d\rho \frac{\rho^{D-1}}{(Q\rho)^{D/2-1}} J_{G+\frac{D}{2}-1}(Q\rho) u_{[G]}(\rho) . \quad (50)$$

In this paper, HH functions with definite total angular momentum L , M are used. They are constructed (in configuration-space as an example) by the following coupling scheme,

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G\},LM}(\Omega_N) = & \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_N} (\ell_1 m_1 \ell_2 m_2 | L_2 M_2) (L_2 M_2 \ell_3 m_3 | L_3 M_3) \times \\ & \cdots \times (L_{N-1} M_{N-1} \ell_N m_N | LM) Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N) , \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where $Y_{[G]}(\Omega_N)$ is defined by Eq. (28), $(\ell_1 m_1 \ell_2 m_2 | L_2 M_2)$ and so on are Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and $M_i = \sum_{j=1,i} m_j$. The symbol $\{G\}$ of the function ${}^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G\},LM}(\Omega_N)$ now stands for the following set of quantum numbers

$$\{G\} \equiv \{\ell_1, \dots, \ell_N, L_2, \dots, L_{N-1}, n_2, \dots, n_N\} . \quad (52)$$

The explicit expression of a HH function for $A = 3$ is

$${}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1 \ell_2 n_2\},LM}(\Omega_2) = [Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2)]_{LM} {}^{(2)}\mathcal{P}_{n_2}^{\ell_1, \ell_2}(\varphi_2) , \quad (53)$$

whereas for $A = 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1 \ell_2 \ell_3 L_2 n_2 n_3\},LM}(\Omega_3) = & \left[[Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2)]_{L_2} Y_{\ell_3}(\hat{x}_3) \right]_{LM} \\ & \times {}^{(2)}\mathcal{P}_{n_2}^{\ell_1, \ell_2}(\varphi_2) {}^{(3)}\mathcal{P}_{n_3}^{2n_2+\ell_1+\ell_2, \ell_3}(\varphi_3) . \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

4. HH and CHH Expansions

In this section, a brief description of the HH expansion with or without the inclusion of correlation factors is presented. In the first subsection, we deal with the “standard” HH expansion for the systems of $A = 3$ and 4 nucleons. The transformation coefficients relating HH functions given in different sets of Jacobi coordinates are introduced in Sec. 4.2. It is well known that for realistic NN interactions the HH expansion is slowly convergent. An extensively used method to overcome such an unpleasant behavior is presented in Sec. 4.3, where the correlated HH expansion is introduced. The calculation of the correlation functions is discussed in Appendix C. In Sec. 4.4, some technical details of the practical applications of these expansions are reported.

4.1. The HH Expansion

Let us consider first the bound state of a trinucleon system with total angular momentum J, J_z , and parity π . The complete antisymmetrization of the state is guaranteed by writing the wave function as a sum of three Faddeev-like amplitudes

$$\Psi_3 = \sum_{p=1}^3 \psi(\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)}) , \quad (55)$$

where

$$\mathbf{x}_2^{(p)} = \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j, \quad \mathbf{x}_1^{(p)} = \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}} \left(\mathbf{r}_k - \frac{\mathbf{r}_i + \mathbf{r}_j}{2} \right), \quad (56)$$

are the Jacobi vectors corresponding to the p -th even permutation of the three particles (corresponding hereafter to the ordering i, j, k of the particles). The generic amplitude $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)})$ is, by construction, antisymmetric with respect to the exchange of particles i and j . Each $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)})$ can be expanded in HH functions as

$$\psi(\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_c} \sum_{n=N_\alpha^0}^{N_\alpha} \sum_{l=0}^M c_{\alpha,n,l} f_l(\rho) B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p), \quad (57)$$

where $f_l(\rho)$ is a complete set of functions for the variable ρ whose choice will be discussed in Sec. 4.4, and

$$B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) = \left\{ {}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_{1\alpha}\ell_{2\alpha}n\}, L_\alpha}(\Omega_2^{(p)}) [S_{a\alpha} s_k]_{S_\alpha} \right\}_{JJ_z} [T_{a\alpha} t_k]_{T_\alpha T_z}. \quad (58)$$

Here ${}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}$ is the HH function defined in Eq. (53) with

$$\Omega_2^{(p)} \equiv \{\hat{x}_1^{(p)}, \hat{x}_2^{(p)}, \varphi_2^{(p)}\}, \quad \cos \varphi_2^{(p)} = \frac{x_2^{(p)}}{\rho}, \quad (59)$$

and s_k (t_k) denotes the spin (isospin) state of particle k , whereas $S_{a\alpha}$ ($T_{a\alpha}$) the spin (isospin) of the i, j pair. Moreover, the total spin S_α is coupled with L_α to give the total angular momentum JJ_z . The set of quantum numbers

$$\alpha \equiv \{\ell_{1\alpha}, \ell_{2\alpha}, L_\alpha, S_{a\alpha}, S_\alpha, T_{a\alpha}, T_\alpha\}, \quad (60)$$

is usually denoted as “channel”. The sum over α is truncated after the inclusion of the N_c most important channels. Note that we allow for the possibility to have states of different total isospin T_α ($= 1/2$ or $3/2$) in our expansion. The quantum numbers of any channel must satisfy two requirements: in order to ensure the antisymmetry of the wave function, the amplitudes ψ have to change sign under the exchange of the particles i and j , and therefore the number $\ell_{2\alpha} + S_{a\alpha} + T_{a\alpha}$ must be odd. In addition, $\ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha}$ must be an even or odd number in correspondence to the positive or negative parity of the considered state. The quantum numbers of the most important channels are given in Table 1.

An important property of the basis elements is the following: due to the sum over the permutations in Eq. (55), some states

$$\mathcal{B}_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}} = \sum_{p=1}^3 B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) \quad (61)$$

are linearly dependent on others. Such states can be removed from the expansion basis by choosing appropriate values for the quantities N_α^0 in Eq. (57). As a matter of fact, the minimum N_α^0 to be considered depends on the set of channels and the HH functions included in the expansion of the wave function. For example, the states $\mathcal{B}_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}$ of the first two channels reported in Table 1 with $n = 0, 1$ are identical. This means that, if the first

Table 1. Quantum numbers and N_α^0 values for the first 14 channels considered in the expansion of the even parity and $J = 1/2$ wave function of a three-nucleon system.

α	$\ell_{1\alpha}$	$\ell_{2\alpha}$	L_α	$S_{a\alpha}$	S_α	$T_{a\alpha}$	T_α	N_α^0
1	0	0	0	1	1/2	0	1/2	0
2	0	0	0	0	1/2	1	1/2	2
3	0	2	2	1	3/2	0	1/2	0
4	2	0	2	1	3/2	0	1/2	1
5	1	1	0	1	1/2	1	1/2	2
6	1	1	1	1	1/2	1	1/2	0
7	1	1	1	1	3/2	1	1/2	1
8	1	1	2	1	3/2	1	1/2	2
9	1	1	0	0	1/2	0	1/2	4
10	1	1	1	0	1/2	0	1/2	2
11	2	2	0	1	1/2	0	1/2	4
12	2	2	2	1	3/2	0	1/2	2
13	2	2	1	1	1/2	0	1/2	2
14	2	2	1	1	3/2	0	1/2	3

two states of the channel $\alpha = 1$ are included in the calculation, we must use $N_2^0 = 2$. A similar analysis has been made for all the channels and the minimum values N_α^0 needed to avoid linearly dependent elements have been reported in Table 1. The number of HH functions included in each channel is simply given by $M_\alpha = N_\alpha - N_\alpha^0 + 1$.

As a result of a number of investigations on the problem [64, 83, 84], it is well known that the components of $\psi(\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)})$ with definite values of the angular momenta $\ell_{1\alpha}, \ell_{2\alpha}$ give contributions rapidly decreasing when these values increase. As a matter of fact, the components with $\ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha} > 6$ give nearly negligible contributions in the case of all the available two-body NN interactions. On the contrary, very high values of the order n of the Jacobi polynomials must be considered in Eq. (57).

We now generalize the HH approach to the four-body system. The wave function of a $A = 4$ system having total angular momentum J , J_z , and parity π can be written as

$$\Psi_4 = \sum_{p=1}^{12} \left[\psi_A(\mathbf{x}_{1A}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{2A}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{3A}^{(p)}) + \psi_B(\mathbf{x}_{1B}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{2B}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{3B}^{(p)}) \right], \quad (62)$$

where the sum is taken over the twelve even permutations p of the particles. In the remainder, we suppose that the permutation p corresponds to the order i, j, k, m of the particles. The vectors $\mathbf{x}_{1A}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{2A}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{3A}^{(p)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_{1B}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{2B}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{3B}^{(p)}$ are the two possible sets of Jacobi vectors defined in Eq. (6). Each amplitude ψ is then expanded in terms of the HH functions defined in Eq.(54):

$$\psi_X(\mathbf{x}_{1X}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{2X}^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_{3X}^{(p)}) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_c^X} \sum_{n_2, n_3=0}^{N_\alpha} \sum_{l=0}^M c_{X,\alpha,n_2n_3,l} f_l(\rho) B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p), \quad (63)$$

where $X \equiv A$ or B and

$$B_{A,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) = \left\{ {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_{1\alpha}\ell_{2\alpha}\ell_{3\alpha}L_{2\alpha}n_2n_3\},L_\alpha}(\Omega_3^{(A,p)}) \times \right. \\ \left. \times \left[\left[[s_i s_j]_{S_{a\alpha}} s_k \right]_{S_{b\alpha}} s_m \right]_{S_\alpha} \right\}_{JJ_z} \left[\left[[t_i t_j]_{T_{a\alpha}} t_k \right]_{T_{b\alpha}} t_m \right]_{T_\alpha T_z}, \quad (64)$$

$$B_{B,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) = \left\{ {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_{1\alpha}\ell_{2\alpha}\ell_{3\alpha}L_{2\alpha}n_2n_3\},L_\alpha}(\Omega_3^{(B,p)}) \times \right. \\ \left. \times \left[[s_i s_j]_{S_{a\alpha}} [s_k s_m]_{S_{b\alpha}} \right]_{S_\alpha} \right\}_{JJ_z} \left[[t_i t_j]_{T_{a\alpha}} [t_k t_m]_{T_{b\alpha}} \right]_{T_\alpha T_z}. \quad (65)$$

Here, $\Omega_3^{(X,p)}$ denotes the hyperangular variables constructed with the set X of the Jacobi vectors relative to the permutation p of the particles. Moreover, s_i (t_i) denotes the spin (isospin) state of particle i and

$$\alpha \equiv \{\ell_{1\alpha}, \ell_{2\alpha}, \ell_{3\alpha}, L_{2\alpha}, L_\alpha, S_{a\alpha}, S_{b\alpha}, S_\alpha, T_{a\alpha}, T_{b\alpha}, T_\alpha\}, \quad (66)$$

specifies the generic four-body channel. In Eqs. (64) and (65) L_α and S_α are coupled to give J , J_z . In order to ensure the antisymmetry of the wave function, the amplitudes ψ_A and ψ_B have to change sign under the exchange of the particles i and j . Therefore, the number $\ell_{3\alpha} + S_{a\alpha} + T_{a\alpha}$ must be odd. In addition, $\ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha} + \ell_{3\alpha}$ must be an even or odd number in correspondence to the positive or negative parity of the considered state. A few of the channels taken into account in the calculations are given in Table 2.

As in the three-body case, the contribution of channels with $\ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha} + \ell_{3\alpha} > 6$ can be disregarded. However, the sum over n_2 and n_3 usually includes a very large number of terms. It has been found convenient to limit the sum over n_2 and n_3 in Eq. (63) to include HH functions with $0 \leq n_2 + n_3 \leq N_\alpha$, N_α being a non-negative integer. For a given N_α , the number M_α of functions included in the expansion of the channel α is given by

$$M_\alpha = (N_\alpha + 1)(N_\alpha + 2)/2. \quad (67)$$

After antisymmetrization of the state, some of the functions

$$\mathcal{B}_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}} = \sum_{p=1}^{12} B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) \quad (68)$$

are linearly dependent on others and they must be removed from the expansion. As an example, it can be verified that $\mathcal{B}_{A,0n_3\alpha=1}^{\text{HH}} = \mathcal{B}_{A,0n_3\alpha=2}^{\text{HH}}$ for all n_3 values (the channels $\alpha = 1, 2$ are specified in Table 2). In this respect, it is useful to know how many linearly independent states $\mathcal{B}$ exist for a given set of values of G , L , S and T , with $G = \ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha} + \ell_{3\alpha} + 2n_2 + 2n_3$. Such a number has been calculated in Ref. [85], where it has been shown that it is significantly less than the degeneracy of the basis. As a result, a large number of states has to be removed from the expansion and, after that, the number M_α results to be appreciably lower than that given in Eq. (67).

Table 2. Quantum numbers for the first 23 channels considered in the expansion of the even-parity and $J = 0$ wave function of a four-nucleon system for the set A of Jacobi coordinates.

α	$\ell_{1\alpha}$	$\ell_{2\alpha}$	$\ell_{3\alpha}$	$L_{2\alpha}$	L_α	$S_{a\alpha}$	$S_{b\alpha}$	S_α	$T_{a\alpha}$	$T_{b\alpha}$	T_α
1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1/2	0	0	1/2	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/2	0	1	1/2	0
3	0	0	2	0	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0
4	1	1	0	0	0	1	1/2	0	0	1/2	0
5	1	1	0	0	0	0	1/2	0	1	1/2	0
6	1	1	0	1	1	1	1/2	1	0	1/2	0
7	1	1	0	1	1	1	3/2	1	0	1/2	0
8	1	1	0	1	1	0	1/2	1	1	1/2	0
9	0	2	0	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0
10	2	0	0	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0
11	1	1	0	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0
12	1	0	1	1	0	1	1/2	0	1	1/2	0
13	1	0	1	1	0	0	1/2	0	0	1/2	0
14	0	1	1	1	0	1	1/2	0	1	1/2	0
15	0	1	1	1	0	0	1/2	0	0	1/2	0
16	1	0	1	1	1	1	1/2	1	1	1/2	0
17	1	0	1	1	1	1	3/2	1	1	1/2	0
18	1	0	1	1	1	0	1/2	1	0	1/2	0
19	0	1	1	1	1	1	1/2	1	1	1/2	0
20	0	1	1	1	1	1	3/2	1	1	1/2	0
21	0	1	1	1	1	0	1/2	1	0	1/2	0
22	1	0	1	1	2	1	3/2	2	1	1/2	0
23	0	1	1	1	2	1	3/2	2	1	1/2	0

4.2. The Transformation Coefficients

As discussed previously, in the case of A identical fermions, antisymmetrical states can be obtained by appropriate sums over the particle permutations. The calculation of the matrix elements of the potential between such states presents noticeable difficulties. In general, the integrals to be evaluated involve the potential and two HH functions constructed in terms of Jacobi vectors corresponding to different permutations of the particles. This task is simplified by the knowledge of the following transformation coefficients (TC),

$${}^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G\},LM}(\Omega_N^{(p)}) = \sum_{\{G'\}} a_{\{G\},\{G'\}}^{(p),G,L} {}^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G'\},LM}(\Omega_N) , \quad (69)$$

where the sum is over all the quantum numbers $\{G'\}$ specified in Eq. (52), with the condition that the grand angular momentum G defined in Eq. (30) is conserved, $G' = G$. As the number of functions with a given G value is finite, also the sum in Eq. (69) is over a finite number of terms. In Eq. (69), $\Omega_N^{(p)}$ (Ω_N) specifies the hyperangular variables constructed with the permutation p of the particles. To simplify the notation for $p = 1$, in this section the subscript “1” will be omitted.

For the three-body system, these coefficients can be easily calculated using recurrence relations [86]. However, the TC can also be calculated by taking into account the orthonormality of the HH basis, namely

$$a_{\{G\},\{G'\}}^{(p),G,L} = \int d\Omega_N [^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G'\},LM}(\Omega_N)]^\dagger ^{(A)}\mathcal{H}_{\{G\},LM}(\Omega_N^{(p)}) . \quad (70)$$

For $A = 3$, the above integrals reduce to bi-dimensional integrals of polynomial functions which can be calculated exactly using Gauss quadrature as discussed in Appendix A. For $A = 4$, Eq. (70) results in a 5-dimensional integration. In that case it is more useful to use a recurrence formula, derived in Ref. [85], and briefly outlined in Appendix B.

The spin-isospin states appearing in Eqs. (58), (64) and (65) can be transformed in terms of spin-isospin states constructed using the reference order $1, 2, 3, \dots$ of the particles. The resulting states have the same total spin S_α and total isospin T_α as the initial states. Therefore, the complete functions $B_{n_2\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p)$ and $B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p)$ can be transformed to the reference permutation $p = 1$ and a given choice of Jacobi vectors. For example, for $A = 4$,

$$B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) = \sum_{\mu'} a_{n'_2n'_3\alpha'}^{X,n_2n_3\alpha}(p) B_{A,n'_2n'_3\alpha'}^{\text{HH}}(p=1) , \quad \mu' \equiv \{n'_2, n'_3, \alpha'\} , \quad (71)$$

where the sum is restricted to the indices n'_2 and n'_3 and channels α' such that $G = \ell_{1\alpha} + \ell_{2\alpha} + \ell_{3\alpha} + 2n_2 + 2n_3 = \ell_{1\alpha'} + \ell_{2\alpha'} + \ell_{3\alpha'} + 2n'_2 + 2n'_3$, $L_\alpha = L_{\alpha'}$, $S_\alpha = S_{\alpha'}$ and $T_\alpha = T_{\alpha'}$. Hence, summing over all the even permutations, it is possible to define a completely antisymmetric basis state given in the reference system $p = 1$:

$$\sum_{p=1}^{12} B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) \equiv \mathcal{B}_{X,\mu}^{GL_\alpha S_\alpha T_\alpha, J\pi} = \sum_{\mu'} A_{X,\mu,\mu'}^{GL_\alpha S_\alpha T_\alpha, J\pi} B_{A,n'_2n'_3\alpha'}^{\text{HH}}(p=1) , \quad (72)$$

with $\mu \equiv \{n_2, n_3, \ell_{1\alpha}, \ell_{2\alpha}, \ell_{3\alpha}, L_{2\alpha}, S_{a\alpha}, S_{b\alpha}, T_{a\alpha}, T_{b\alpha}\}$ and

$$A_{X,\mu,\mu'}^{GL_\alpha S_\alpha T_\alpha, J\pi} = \sum_{p=1}^{12} a_{n'_2n'_3\alpha'}^{X,n_2n_3\alpha}(p) . \quad (73)$$

The same analysis holds for the $A = 3$ system, where now $\mu \equiv \{n_2, \ell_{1\alpha}, \ell_{2\alpha}, S_{a\alpha}, T_{a\alpha}\}$ and $\mu' \equiv \{n'_2, \alpha'\}$. Finally, the wave function of an $A = 3, 4$ system can be expanded as

$$\Psi_A^{J\pi} = \sum_{GLSTX} \sum_{\mu,l} C_{X,\mu,l}^{GLST} \mathcal{B}_{X,\mu}^{GLST, J\pi} f_l(\rho) , \quad (74)$$

where the coefficients $C_{X,\mu,l}^{GLST}$ are linear parameters (for $A = 3$, the sum over X is restricted to the single choice of Jacobi vectors specified in Eq. (56)). The above expansion can also be given in momentum space:

$$\Psi_A^{J\pi} = \sum_{GLSTX} \sum_{\mu,l} C_{X,\mu,l}^{GLST} \tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{X,\mu}^{GLST, J\pi} g_{G,l}(Q) , \quad (75)$$

where $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}_{X,\mu}^{GLST, J\pi}$ is now the hyperspherical-spin-isospin amplitude in momentum space and, according to Eq. (50),

$$g_{G,l}(Q) = (-i)^G \int_0^\infty d\rho \frac{\rho^{3N-1}}{(Q\rho)^{3N/2-1}} J_{G+3N/2-1}(Q\rho) f_l(\rho) . \quad (76)$$

Sometimes it will be convenient to consider HH functions having a specific value of j , the total angular momentum of particles 1, 2. To this aim, it is useful to write the basis in the jj -coupling scheme

$$\mathcal{B}_{X,\mu}^{GLST,J\pi} = \sum_{\nu} \mathcal{A}_{X,\mu,\nu}^{GLST,J\pi} \Xi_{\nu}^{GTJ\pi} . \quad (77)$$

The basis functions $\Xi_{\nu}^{GTJ\pi}$ are HH functions in which the angular-spin part for $A = 3$ is coupled as

$$\left[\left(Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2) S_a \right)_{j_a} \left(Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) s_3 \right)_{j_b} \right]_{JJ_z} , \quad (78)$$

and, for $A = 4$, as

$$\left\{ \left[\left(Y_{\ell_3}(\hat{x}_3) S_a \right)_{j_3} \left(Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2) s_3 \right)_{j_2} \right]_{J_2} \left(Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) s_4 \right)_{j_1} \right\}_{JJ_z} . \quad (79)$$

The coefficients $\mathcal{A}_{X,\mu,\nu}^{GLSTJ\pi}$ are related to $A_{X,\mu,\mu'}^{GLSTJ\pi}$ via Wigner coefficients. Now, the integer index ν labels all possible choices of

$$\nu \equiv \{n_2, \ell_2, S_a, j_a, \ell_1, j_b, T_a\} , \quad \text{for } A = 3 , \quad (80)$$

$$\nu \equiv \{n_3, \ell_3, S_a, j_3, n_2, \ell_2, j_2, J_2, \ell_1, j_1, T_a, T_b\} , \quad \text{for } A = 4 , \quad (81)$$

compatible with the given values of G , T , J and π .

4.3. The PHH and CHH Expansion

The rate of convergence of the HH expansion results to be rather slow when the particle interaction contains large repulsion at small distances. For example, in the calculation of the trinucleon binding energy with the AV18 NN potential, HH functions with G up to 180 were considered [61]. The resulting expansion included a large number of terms (approximately 600). Only in that way, the calculated binding energy was found to be in agreement with the corresponding estimates obtained by other techniques [87, 88, 89, 90, 91]. The calculation rapidly becomes more and more involved when larger systems are considered. For the α -particle, for example, approximately 4000 states have to be included in Eq. (62).

In order to overcome this difficulty, in Ref. [92] the radial dependence of each amplitude has been modified by the inclusion of a suitably chosen correlation factor (correlated-HH or, briefly, CHH expansion). The role of the correlation factors is to speed up the convergence of the expansion by improving the description of the system when two particles are close to each other. In such configurations, there are large cancellations between the contributions from kinetic and potential energy terms and therefore the wave function must be very precisely constructed. Thus, it can be convenient to include from the very beginning in the wave function suitable terms for describing those configurations. In this way, the number of basis functions necessary to get convergence is strongly reduced.

For the three-body system, the functions $B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p)$ in Eq. (57) are replaced by the following ones,

$$B_{n\alpha}^{\text{CHH}}(p) = F_{\alpha p}^{(3)} B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) , \quad (82)$$

where $F_{\alpha p}^{(3)}$ is a correlation factor which, in general, will depend on the channel α and the permutation p of the particles. In order to maintain the antisymmetry of the wave function, $F_{\alpha p}^{(3)}$ is taken to be symmetric under the exchange of particles i and j . A choice of $F_{\alpha p}^{(3)}$, which has been extensively investigated, is

$$F_{\alpha p}^{(3)} = f_{\alpha}(r_{ij})g_{\alpha}(r_{jk})g_{\alpha}(r_{ik}) , \quad (83)$$

where f_{α} and g_{α} are unidimensional functions determined as discussed in Appendix C.

For a four-body system, the functions

$$B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{CHH}}(p) = F_{\alpha p}^{(4)} B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) \quad (84)$$

are used to replace $B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p)$ in Eq. (63). In this case, the correlation factors have been taken of the form [63]

$$F_{\alpha p}^{(4)} = f_{\alpha}(r_{ij})g_{\alpha}(r_{ik})g_{\alpha}(r_{jk})g_{\alpha}(r_{im})g_{\alpha}(r_{jm})h_{\alpha}(r_{km}) , \quad (85)$$

where f_{α} , g_{α} and h_{α} are unidimensional functions of the interparticle distances. The choice of these functions is also discussed in Appendix C.

The correlation factors so far introduced are of the Jastrow type, namely they are given by products over all the particle pairs. A simplified choice consists in correlating only one pair. The expansion basis obtained is called the pair-correlated hyperspherical harmonic (PHH) expansion, which, for a three-body system, is given by [62]

$$B_{n\alpha}^{\text{PHH}}(p) = f_{\alpha}(r_{ij})B_{n\alpha}^{\text{HH}}(p) . \quad (86)$$

The use of this (simplified) correlation factor has been shown to provide very accurate results.

It should be noticed that, with the inclusion of the correlation factors, the linear dependence between the states discussed in the previous subsections has to be reconsidered. In fact, for the $A = 3$ case, the minimum values N_{α}^0 of the index n entering in Eq. (57) can be taken to be $N_{\alpha}^0 = 0$ for all the considered channels. Also for $A = 4$, the linear dependent states reduce to a small number (the actual number depends on the particular choice of the correlation factors).

As for the HH expansion, it is possible to define a completely antisymmetric correlated state for $A = 3$

$$\mathcal{B}_{n\alpha}^{\lambda} = \sum_{p=1}^3 B_{n\alpha}^{\lambda}(p) , \quad (87)$$

and for $A = 4$

$$\mathcal{B}_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\lambda} = \sum_{p=1}^{12} B_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^{\lambda}(p) , \quad (88)$$

where $\lambda \equiv \text{CHH}$ or PHH . Accordingly it is possible to expand the $A = 3, 4$ wave function in such a basis

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi_3^{J\pi} &= \sum_{ln\alpha} C_{nl}^\alpha f_l(\rho) \mathcal{B}_{n\alpha}^\lambda, \\ \Psi_4^{J\pi} &= \sum_{lXn_2n_3\alpha} C_{Xn_2n_3l}^\alpha f_l(\rho) \mathcal{B}_{X,n_2n_3\alpha}^\lambda.\end{aligned}\quad (89)$$

A difference with the HH expansion is that the basis states are not labelled with the grand angular momentum G , due to the presence of the correlation factors. Furthermore, the presence of correlation factors complicates the transformation of the states given in permutation p to the reference system $p = 1$. As a consequence, multidimensional integrals have to be calculated to obtain the matrix elements when using the correlated basis states. This can be done very efficiently for $A = 3$ whereas, for $A = 4$, a stochastic integration method should be used.

4.4. Details of the Calculation

In general, the $A = 3$ and 4 bound state wave functions can be cast in the form

$$|\Psi_A^{J\pi}\rangle = \sum_{\zeta} c_{\zeta} |\Psi_{\zeta}\rangle, \quad (90)$$

where $|\Psi_{\zeta}\rangle$ is one of the complete set of antisymmetric states defined in the preceding sections, and ζ is an index denoting all the quantum numbers necessary to completely specify the basis elements. The coefficients of the expansion can be calculated using the Rayleigh-Ritz variational principle, which states that

$$\langle \delta_c \Psi_A^{J\pi} | H - E | \Psi_A^{J\pi} \rangle = 0, \quad (91)$$

where $\delta_c \Psi_A^{J\pi}$ indicates the variation of the wave function for arbitrary infinitesimal changes of the linear coefficients c_{ζ} . The problem of determining c_{ζ} and the energy E is then reduced to a generalized eigenvalue problem,

$$\sum_{\zeta'} \langle \Psi_{\zeta} | H - E | \Psi_{\zeta'} \rangle c_{\zeta'} = 0. \quad (92)$$

The main difficulty of the method is to compute the matrix elements of the Hamiltonian H with respect to the basis states $|\Psi_{\zeta}\rangle$. Usually H is given as a sum of terms (kinetic energy, two-body potential, etc.). The calculation of the matrix elements of some parts of H can be more conveniently performed in coordinate space, while for other parts it could be easier to work in momentum space.

In the case of the HH expansion, the basis states are given in coordinate (momentum) space in Eq. (74) (Eq. (75)). The criteria to choose hyperradial functions $f_l(\rho)$ have been the following: (i) $f_l(\rho) \rightarrow 0$ for $\rho \rightarrow \infty$; (ii) $f_l(\rho)$ should constitute an orthonormal basis; (iii) $f_l(\rho)$ should be easy to handle, when the Fourier transform of Eq. (50) is performed. A possible choice used here is given by

$$f_l(\rho) = \gamma^{D/2} \sqrt{\frac{l!}{(l+D-1)!}} L_l^{(D-1)}(\gamma\rho) e^{-\frac{\gamma}{2}\rho}, \quad (93)$$

where $L_l^{(D-1)}(\gamma\rho)$ are Laguerre polynomials [82]. Here, there is only one non-linear parameter, γ , to be variationally optimized. In particular, γ can be chosen in the interval 2.5–4.5 fm⁻¹ for the AV18 and CDBonn potentials and 4–8 fm⁻¹ for the N3LO-like potential, for both $A = 3$ and 4. The corresponding functions $g_{G,l}(Q)$ can be written as

$$g_{G,l}(Q) = \frac{(-i)^G}{\gamma^{D/2}} \sqrt{\frac{l!}{(l+D-1)!}} \sum_{k=0}^l b_k^l 2^{k+D} \Gamma(G+k+D) \times \frac{u^{k+D}}{(1-u^2)^{\frac{D}{4}-\frac{1}{2}}} P_{k+D/2}^{1-G-D/2}(u), \quad (94)$$

where $u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1+(2Q/\gamma)^2}}$, P_n^m is an associated Legendre function and b_k^l is given by

$$b_k^l = \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \binom{l+D-1}{l-k}, \quad (95)$$

so that $L_l^{(D-1)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^l b_k^l x^k$ [82].

In such a case, the normalization (N) and kinetic energy (T) operator matrix elements can be easily computed, both in coordinate or in momentum space. Explicitly they are

$$N_{X\mu l, X'\mu' l'}^{GLSTJ\pi} = \sum_{\mu''} (A_{X,\mu\mu''}^{GLSTJ\pi})^* A_{X',\mu'\mu''}^{GLSTJ\pi} \delta_{l,l'}, \quad (96)$$

$$T_{X\mu l, X'\mu' l'}^{GLSTJ\pi} = \sum_{\mu''} (A_{X,\mu\mu''}^{GLSTJ\pi})^* A_{X',\mu'\mu''}^{GLSTJ\pi} T_{l,l'}, \quad (97)$$

with

$$T_{l,l'} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int d\rho \rho^{3A-4} f_{l'}(\rho) \left[\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \rho^2} + \frac{3A-4}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} - \frac{G(G+3A-4)}{\rho^2} \right] f_l(\rho) \\ = \frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \int dQ Q^{3A-2} g_{G,l'}(Q) g_{G,l}(Q), \quad (98)$$

where use has been made of the fact that the HH functions are eigenfunctions of the operator $\Lambda_N^2(\Omega_N)$ defined in Eq. (13) corresponding to the eigenvalues $G(G+3A-4)$, and that the functions $f_l(\rho)$ form an orthonormal set with respect to the weight ρ^{3A-4} . The calculation of the two-body potential energy matrix elements is more conveniently performed using the hyperspherical-angular-spin-isospin basis elements $\Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi}$, which have a well defined angular momentum j between particles 1, 2, and are totally antisymmetric. Therefore, the following relation holds

$$\langle \Xi_{\mu'}^{G'T'J\pi} | V | \Xi_\mu^{GTJ\pi} \rangle = \frac{A(A-1)}{2} \langle \Xi_{\mu'}^{G'T'J\pi} | v(1,2) | \Xi_\mu^{GTJ\pi} \rangle. \quad (99)$$

The potential $v(1,2)$ acts on the particle pair 1,2, accordingly to the quantum number j and all other quantum numbers in μ , with the exception of $S_{a\alpha}$, $T_{a\alpha}$ and $\ell_{1,\alpha}$ ($\ell_{1,\alpha}, \ell_{2,\alpha}$) for $A = 3$ ($A = 4$), which are conserved. This reduces considerably the total number of matrix elements needed in the calculation. Moreover, using the TC introduced in

Sec. 4.2, the above equation reduces to a two-dimensional integral in one hyperangle ($\cos \phi_3$ for $A = 4$ or $\cos \phi$ for $A = 3$) and ρ .

In the case of non-local potentials, one has

$$v(1, 2) = V(\mathbf{x}'_N, \mathbf{x}_N) \quad (100)$$

in coordinate space, and

$$v(1, 2) = \tilde{V}(\mathbf{k}'_N, \mathbf{k}_N) \quad (101)$$

in momentum space, where the spin-isospin-dependence is understood. The integrals of Eq. (99) then are three-dimensional, and can be calculated using Tchebyshev and Laguerre weights and points for the hyperangular and the hyperradial variables, respectively [82]. A sufficiently dense grid can be used to obtain relative errors $< 10^{-6}$ for these integrals. More details about the procedure to compute matrix elements of the NN and 3N interactions are given in Appendix D.

In the case of the CHH or PHH expansion, the matrix elements of the norm, kinetic energy and potential energy are all calculated numerically. These expansions have been used to treat the case of local potentials. The corresponding integrals reduce to three dimensions for $A = 3$ and to six dimensions for $A = 4$. In the first case a Gauss, Tchebyshev, Laguerre integration has been used for the variables $\mu_{12} = \hat{x}_1 \cdot \hat{x}_2$, $z = \cos 2\phi$, and ρ , whereas a quasirandom technique has been used for $A = 4$.

5. The HH Technique for Scattering States

We consider in this section the application of the HH expansion to a scattering problem. In particular, we focus our attention to elastic processes of the type $N + Y \rightarrow N + Y$, where N is a nucleon and Y is a bound nuclear system ($A_Y + 1 = A = 3, 4$), in the low energy region, where the nucleus Y cannot be broken.

The wave function $\Psi_{N-Y}^{LSJJ_z}$ describing a $N-Y$ scattering state with incoming orbital angular momentum L and channel spin S ($\vec{S} = \frac{\vec{1}}{2} + \vec{S}_Y$), parity $\pi = (-)^L$, and total angular momentum J, J_z , can be written as

$$\Psi_{N-Y}^{LSJJ_z} = \Psi_C^{LSJJ_z} + \Psi_A^{LSJJ_z}, \quad (102)$$

where $\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z}$ describes the system in the region where the particles are close to each other and their mutual interactions are strong, while $\Psi_A^{LSJJ_z}$ describes the relative motion between the nucleon N and the nucleus Y in the asymptotic region, where the $N-Y$ nuclear interaction is negligible. The function $\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z}$, which has to vanish in the limit of large intercluster separations, can be expanded either in the HH or CHH basis as it has been done in the case of bound states (see Eqs. (55) and (62) for the HH and Eq. (89) for the CHH expansion). Therefore, applying Eq. (90), the function $\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z}$ can be casted in the form

$$|\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z}\rangle = \sum_{\zeta} c_{\zeta} |\Psi_{\zeta}\rangle, \quad (103)$$

where $|\Psi_{\zeta}\rangle$ is defined in Sec. 4.

The function $\Psi_A^{LSJJ_z}$ is the appropriate asymptotic solution of the relative $N - Y$ Schrödinger equation, and can be written as a linear combination of the following functions

$$\Omega_{LSJJ_z}^\lambda = \frac{\mathcal{C}}{\sqrt{N_p}} \sum_{p=1}^{N_p} \left[[\chi_N \otimes \phi_Y]_S \otimes Y_L(\hat{y}_p) \right]_{JJ_z} \mathcal{R}_L^\lambda(y_p), \quad (104)$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is a normalization factor (see below). Here the sum over p has to be done over the even N_p permutations of the A nucleons necessary to antisymmetrize the functions $\Omega_{LSJJ_z}^\lambda$, ϕ_Y (χ_N) is the Y (N) wave function, $\mathbf{y}_p$ is the distance between N and the center of mass of Y , $Y_L(\hat{y}_p)$ is the standard spherical harmonic function, and the functions $\mathcal{R}_L^\lambda(y_p)$ are the regular ($\lambda \equiv R$) and irregular ($\lambda \equiv I$) radial solutions of the relative two-body $N - Y$ Schrödinger equation without the nuclear interaction. These regular and irregular functions, denoted as $\mathcal{F}_L(y_p)$ and $\mathcal{G}_L(y_p)$ respectively, have the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_L(y_p) &= \frac{F_L(\eta, \xi)}{(2L+1)!! q^L \xi C_L(\eta)}, \\ \mathcal{G}_L(y_p) &= (2L+1)!! q^{L+1} C_L(\eta) f_R(y_p) \frac{G_L(\eta, \xi)}{\xi}, \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

where q is the modulus of the $N - Y$ relative momentum (related to the total kinetic energy in the center of mass (c.m.) system by $T_{c.m.} = \frac{q^2}{2\mu}$, μ being the $N - Y$ reduced mass), $\eta = 2\mu e^2/q$ and $\xi = qy_p$ are the usual Coulomb parameters, and the regular (irregular) Coulomb function $F_L(\eta, \xi)$ ($G_L(\eta, \xi)$) and the factor $C_L(\eta)$ is defined in the standard way [93]. The factors $(2L+1)!! q^L C_L(\eta)$ have been introduced so that $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{G}$ have a well defined limit for $q \rightarrow 0$. The function $f_R(y_p) = [1 - \exp(-by_p)]^{2L+1}$ has been introduced to regularize G_L at small values of y_p . The trial parameter b is determined by requiring that $f_R(y) \rightarrow 1$ for large values of y_p , thus not modifying the asymptotic behaviour of the scattering wave function. A value of $b \simeq R_Y^{-1}$, R_Y being the dimension of nucleus Y , has been found appropriate. The non-Coulomb case of Eq. (105) is obtained in the limit $e^2 \rightarrow 0$. In this case $F_L(\xi)/\xi$ and $G_L(\xi)/\xi$ reduce to the regular and irregular Riccati-Bessel functions and the factor $(2L+1)!! C_L(\eta) \rightarrow 1$ for $\eta \rightarrow 0$. With the above definitions, $\Psi_A^{LSJJ_z}$ can be written in the form

$$\Psi_A^{LSJJ_z} = \sum_{L'S'} \left[\delta_{LL'} \delta_{SS'} \Omega_{L'S'JJ_z}^R + \mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J(q) \Omega_{L'S'JJ_z}^I \right], \quad (106)$$

where the parameters $\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J(q)$ give the relative weight between the regular and the irregular components of the wave function. They are closely related to the reactance matrix ($\mathcal{K}$ -matrix) elements which can be written as

$$\mathcal{K}_{LS,L'S'}^J = (2L+1)!! (2L'+1)!! q^{L+L'+1} C_L(\eta) C_{L'}(\eta) \mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J. \quad (107)$$

By definition of the $\mathcal{K}$ -matrix, its eigenvalues are $\tan \delta_{LSJ}$, δ_{LSJ} being the phase shifts. The sum over L' and S' in Eq. (106) is over all values compatible with a given J and parity π . In particular, the sum over L' is limited to include either even or odd values since $(-1)^{L'} = \pi$.

The matrix elements $\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J(q)$ and the linear coefficients occurring in the expansion of $\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z\pi}$ are determined applying the Kohn variational principle [43], which states that the functional

$$[\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J(q)] = \mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J(q) - \left\langle \Psi_{N-Y}^{L'S'JJ_z} | H - E | \Psi_{N-Y}^{LSJJ_z} \right\rangle \quad (108)$$

has to be stationary with respect to variations of the trial parameters in $\Psi_{N-Y}^{LSJJ_z}$. Here E is the total energy of the system, and the normalization of the asymptotic states (factor $\mathcal{C}$ in Eq. (104)) has been fixed by the condition:

$$\langle \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^R | H - E | \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^I \rangle - \langle \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^I | H - E | \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^R \rangle = 1 . \quad (109)$$

Using Eqs. (103) and (106), the variation of the diagonal functionals of Eq. (108) with respect to the linear parameters c_ζ leads to the following system of linear equations:

$$\sum_{\zeta'} c_{\zeta'} \langle \Psi_{\zeta} | H - E | \Psi_{\zeta'} \rangle = -D_{LSJJ_z}^\lambda(\zeta) . \quad (110)$$

Two different inhomogeneous terms D^λ corresponding to $\lambda \equiv R, I$ are introduced and are defined as

$$D_{LSJJ_z}^\lambda(\zeta) = \langle \Psi_{\zeta} | H - E | \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^\lambda \rangle . \quad (111)$$

The matrix elements $\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J$ are obtained varying the diagonal functionals of Eq. (108) with respect to them. This leads to the following set of algebraic equations

$$\sum_{L''S''} \mathcal{R}_{LS,L''S''}^J X_{L'S',L''S''} = Y_{LS,L'S'} , \quad (112)$$

with the coefficients X and Y defined as

$$\begin{aligned} X_{LS,L'S'} &= \langle \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^I + \Psi_C^{LSJJ_z,I} | H - E | \Omega_{L'S'JJ_z}^I \rangle , \\ Y_{LS,L'S'} &= - \langle \Omega_{LSJJ_z}^R + \Psi_C^{LSJJ_z,R} | H - E | \Omega_{L'S'JJ_z}^I \rangle , \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

where $\Psi_C^{LSJJ_z,\lambda}$ is the solution of the set of Eq. (110) with the corresponding inhomogeneous term. A second order estimate of $\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J$ is given by the quantities $[\mathcal{R}_{LS,L'S'}^J]$, obtained by substituting in Eq. (108) the first order results.

In the particular case of $q = 0$ (zero-energy scattering), the scattering can occur only in the channel $L = 0$ and the observables of interest are the scattering lengths. Within the present approach, they are defined as

$$^{(2J+1)}a_{NY} = - \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{R}_{0J,0J}^J , \quad (114)$$

and the corresponding asymptotic states are then given by

$$\Psi_A^{0JJ_z} = \left[\Omega_{JJ_z}^R - ^{(2J+1)}a_{NY} \Omega_{JJ_z}^I \right] . \quad (115)$$

6. Results

In this section results are presented for bound and zero-energy scattering states obtained within the HH approach, with and without the inclusion of correlation factors, using several interaction models. The section is divided into the following parts: in Sec. 6.1, the triton and ^4He bound states are studied with 5 different central potentials, which have been used by several groups to produce benchmark calculations. For some of them, different versions appear in the literature causing problems at the moment of comparisons. For this reason, the potential parameters are specified and the HH results are compared to those ones obtained with other techniques. In Sec. 6.2 the $A = 3$ and 4 bound states are studied using the most recent models for the nuclear interaction, consisting of two- and three-nucleon potentials. Their predictions for binding energies and other ground state properties are presented. When possible, comparisons with other methods are also given. Finally, in Sec. 6.3, the results for the nd , pd , $n^3\text{H}$, and $p^3\text{He}$ scattering lengths are presented and discussed.

6.1. Bound States with Central Potentials

Let us firstly consider the $A = 3, 4$ bound states using 5 central two-nucleon potential models, i.e., the Volkov [94], Afnan-Tang S3 (ATS3) [95], Minnesota [96], and Malfliet-Tjon version V (MT-V) and I/III (MT-I/III) [97]. These potentials have been used by several groups to describe bound states of light nuclei. We review here briefly their main characteristics. Each potential $V(r)$ can be written as

$$V(r) = \sum_i v_i f(\mu_i, r) , \quad (116)$$

where the function $f(\mu_i, r)$ is either $\exp(-\mu_i r^2)$ for the Gaussian-type potentials or $\exp(-\mu_i r)/r$ for the Yukawa-type potentials. The operators v_i act on the spin-isospin degrees of freedom and are written as

$$v_i = V_i \times (W_i + M_i P_r + B_i P_\sigma - H_i P_\tau) , \quad (117)$$

where P_r , P_σ and P_τ are the space-, spin- and isospin-exchange operators. The values of parameters V_i , μ_i , W_i , M_i , B_i and H_i of the potentials used in the present work are listed in Table 3. Few remarks are here in order: (i) the Volkov and MT-V are spin-independent models, while the other 3 potentials are spin dependent; (ii) the MT-I/III version acts only on s-waves; (iii) it is customary to include the point-Coulomb interaction ($e^2 = 1.44 \text{ MeV fm}$) with the Minnesota potential; (iv) for all the considered potentials, the total orbital angular momentum is a good quantum number and therefore we have included in the wave functions only the channels with $L = 0$. Finally, note that the Volkov, ATS3, Minnesota and MT-V potentials are equal to those used in Ref. [98], while the version of the MT-I/III here adopted is the same as the one reported in Table I of Ref. [99].

The triton and ^4He binding energies have been calculated for these 5 central interaction models using the HH or the CHH approaches. The results are compared

Table 3. List of the parameters of the central NN potentials used in this paper introduced in Eqs. (116) and (117). The potential strengths V_i are in units of MeV for Gaussian- (G) and MeV fm for Yukawa-type (Y) potentials, respectively. The parameters W_i , M_i , B_i and H_i are dimensionless and the ranges μ_i are in units of fm⁻² for G or fm⁻¹ for Y potentials, respectively. The Majorana mixture parameter M of the Volkov potential and the parameter u in the Minnesota potential are 0 and 1, respectively.

Potential	Type	i	V_i	μ_i	W_i	M_i	B_i	H_i
MT-V [97]	Y	1	1458.047	3.11	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2	-578.089	1.55	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
MT-I/III [97]	Y	1	1438.72	3.11	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2	-570.4255	1.55	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		3	-56.4585	1.55	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0
Volkov [94]	G	1	144.86	0.82^{-2}	$1.0 - M$	M	0.0	0.0
		2	-83.34	1.60^{-2}	$1.0 - M$	M	0.0	0.0
ATS3 [95]	G	1	1000.0	3.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
		2	-326.7	1.05	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0
		3	-166.0	0.80	0.5	0.0	-0.5	0.0
		4	-43.0	0.60	0.5	0.0	0.5	0.0
		5	-23.0	0.40	0.5	0.0	-0.5	0.0
Minnesota [96]	G	1	200.0	1.487	$0.5u$	$1.0 - 0.5u$	0.0	0.0
		2	-178.0	0.639	$0.25u$	$0.5 - 0.25u$	$0.25u$	$0.5 - 0.25u$
		3	-91.85	0.465	$0.25u$	$0.5 - 0.25u$	$-0.25u$	$-0.5 + 0.25u$

to those ones obtained by other techniques in Table 4. In all of these calculation, $\hbar^2/m = 41.47$ MeV fm². Some of the techniques considered in the comparison have already been described in Sec. 1, and they are the FY equations method [40], the SVM [50, 51] and the CRCG expansion technique [49]. Furthermore, the results of the effective-interaction hyperspherical harmonics (EIH) method of Ref. [100] and the ATMS (Amalgamation of Two-body correlation into the Multiple Scattering process) method of Ref. [101] have been reported.

From inspection of the table, we can conclude that: (i) for the Volkov potential with Majorana parameter $M = 0$, our results agree very well with the estimates of the SVM [98] method. Note that the Volkov potential, given as a sum of Gaussians, has a very soft core and therefore the induced two-body correlations in the ground state wave function are weaker than in the other cases. In fact, we have found that the convergence of the HH expansion in this case is quite fast. Since only the inclusion of HH states with fairly low values of the grand angular momentum quantum number is sufficient to obtain convergence, a successful HH calculation for this potential was already possible more than 30 years ago for $A = 3$ [102] and more than 20 years ago for $A = 4$ [103]. (ii) Both for the ATS3 and Minnesota (with exchange parameter $u=1$) potential models, there is a good agreement between the different theoretical estimates. Note that both

Table 4. The triton and ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energies in MeV, calculated for various central interaction models, are compared with the results obtained by other methods.

Potential	Method	$B({}^3\text{H})$	$B({}^4\text{He})$
Volkov	HH	8.465	30.420
	SVM	8.46	30.424
ATS3	HH	8.758	31.618
	CHH	8.758	31.61
	SVM	8.753	31.616
Minnesota	HH	8.3858	29.947
	CHH	8.3858	29.95
	SVM	8.380	29.937
	EIHH	8.3856	29.96
MT-V	HH	8.2527	31.347
	CHH	8.2527	31.357
	SVM	8.2527	31.360
	EIHH	8.244	31.358
	CRGC		31.357
	FY	8.2527	31.364
	ATMS		31.364
MT-I/III	HH	8.5357	30.310
	CHH	8.5357	30.31
	FY	8.5357	30.312

these potentials are given as a sum of Gaussians but have a rather strong repulsion at short interparticle distances. This induces important two-body correlations in the wave function and consequently the convergence is slower than before. A grand angular momentum quantum number of 40 is sufficient for an accuracy of 1 keV in the binding energy. (iii) The MT-V potential is given as a superposition of Yukawians having a strong repulsive core with a $1/r$ divergence. This model, as well as the MT-I/III, represents the most challenging problem for the HH expansion, due to the difficulty of constructing accurate two-body correlations at short interparticle distances, where the cancellation between the kinetic and potential energy terms is critical. The introduction of correlation factors in the HH expansion allows for very accurate results in both the $A = 3$ and 4 systems. The HH without correlation factors requires a large number of basis elements to get convergence. For $A = 3$, the maximum value for the grand angular momentum quantum number (G_{max}) considered has been 200. For $A = 4$, it is possible to extrapolate the HH result to consider infinite number of basis elements, using the procedure of Ref. [65]. For the MT-V potential, the extrapolated HH result is 31.358 MeV, very close to other accurate estimates. For the (s-wave) MT-I/III we observe that our estimate is already close to the very precise calculation of Ref. [99]. The “missing” binding energy in this case is estimated to be 21 keV, bringing our estimated binding energy to be 30.331 MeV.

6.2. Bound State with Realistic Interactions

In this section, the $A = 3$ and 4 bound states are studied using the most recent models for the nuclear interaction, consisting of two- and three-nucleon potentials. We first summarize the main characteristics of these interaction models.

Among the realistic models for the two-nucleon interaction, we have considered the Argonne AV8' [45], v_{14} (AV14) [104] and AV18 [10] models, the Nijmegen 2 (NJ2) [9], and the CDBonn [11] models. We have also considered one of the models developed by Doleschall and collaborators [105], labelled as ISuj model [106]. Note that the Argonne and the NJ2 models are local and expressed in coordinate-space, the ISuj model is also expressed in coordinate-space but is non-local, and the CDBonn model is non-local and expressed in momentum-space. The AV8' potential is a reduction of the AV18 potential including only central, tensor and spin-orbit components, with modified parameters in order to reproduce the deuteron binding energy. We have included it, since it has been used before to produce a benchmark for the α -particle binding energy [66]. Among the potential models derived within an effective field theory approach, we have considered those ones calculated up to next-to-next-to-next-to-leading order by the Idaho [28] (N3LO-Idaho), and by the Jülich [26, 27] (N3LO-Jülich) groups. Note that the N3LO-Idaho model is obtained within a dimensional regularization scheme with cutoff parameter $\Lambda=500$ MeV. The N3LO-Jülich model, instead, uses the spectral function regularization scheme with cutoff parameter $\tilde{\Lambda}$, and an exponential regulator function in order to remove the divergences in the Lippmann-Schwinger equation with cutoff parameter Λ . The cutoff combination $[\Lambda, \tilde{\Lambda}] = [550, 600]$ MeV has been chosen in the present study. Finally, we have considered also two effective low-momentum interactions which have been derived from the AV18 model using a renormalization group approach. The smooth cutoff Λ_{low-k} of the exponential regulator function has been chosen equal to 2 or 3 fm^{-1} ($V_{low-k,2.0}$ and $V_{low-k,3.0}$) [34]. Note that these two V_{low-k} models are different than the ones adopted in some of the earlier works on V_{low-k} [30, 31, 32, 33, 35], where a sharp cutoff formulation was used.

Two remarks are here in order: (i) in the application of the HH expansion using the NJ2, ISuj, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, N3LO-Jülich, and V_{low-k} potential models, a truncation of the model space has been performed at $j_{max}=6$, j_{max} being the maximum two-body total angular momentum considered. The chosen value allows for an accuracy of 1 keV for the triton binding energy. (ii) The point-like Coulomb interaction has been added when the ^3He and ^4He nuclei are considered. However, in the case of the AV18 and NJ2 calculations, the full electromagnetic interaction has been added [9, 44].

As already discussed in Sec. 1, realistic models for the nuclear Hamiltonian include two-nucleon and three-nucleon interaction terms. Among the available two- and three-nucleon interaction models, we have used in the present work the AV18 together with the Urbana IX [14] (AV18/UIX) model and the CDBonn together with the Tucson-Melbourne [16] model (CDBonn/TM). In the TM model, the regularization cutoff parameter Λ_{TM} has been fixed to $4.795 m_\pi$, in order to reproduce the triton binding

Table 5. The triton and the ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energies B (MeV), calculated with the AV18, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, two-nucleon interaction models, and with the AV18/UIX, CDBonn/TM, and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO two- and three-nucleon interactions. Note that in the CDBonn/TM case, the parameter Λ_{TM} has been chosen to be $4.795 m_\pi$ for ${}^3\text{H}$ and $4.784 m_\pi$ for ${}^4\text{He}$. The HH results are compared with the ones obtained with different approaches. See text for explanations. Note that a recently updated FE/FY result [112] for the ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energy calculated with the CDBonn potential is given in parentheses.

Potential	Method	$B({}^3\text{H})$	$B({}^4\text{He})$
AV18	PHH	7.624	–
	HH	7.624	24.22
	FE/FY [108, 107]	7.621	24.23
	FE/FY [110]	7.621	24.24
	FE/FY [39]	7.616	24.22
CDBonn	HH	7.998	26.13
	FE/FY [108, 107, 112]	8.005	26.23 (26.16)
	FE/FY [111]	7.998	26.11
	NCSM [56]	7.99(1)	
N3LO-Idaho	HH	7.854	25.38
	FE/FY [112]	7.854	25.37
	FE/FY [111]	7.854	25.38
	NCSM [109]	7.852(5)	25.39(1)
AV18/UIX	PHH	8.479	–
	HH	8.479	28.47
	FE/FY [108, 107]	8.476	28.53
	FE/FY [39]	8.473	
CDBonn/TM	HH	8.474	29.00
	FE/FY [108, 107]	8.482	29.09
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	HH	8.474	28.37
	NCSM [56]	8.473(5)	28.34(2)

energy when used in conjunction with the CDBonn potential. The parameters a , b , c and d of the potentials are the ones of Table XI of Ref. [107]. However, in the ${}^4\text{He}$ calculation, for the sake of comparison, the CDBonn/TM model has been used with $\Lambda_{\text{TM}} = 4.784 m_\pi$, the same as in Ref. [108].

Within an effective field theory approach, three-nucleon interactions arise when next-to-next-to leading order (N2LO) contributions are considered. Therefore, the $A = 3$ and 4 nuclei have been studied also using the N3LO-Idaho two-nucleon together with the local N2LO three-nucleon interaction as developed by Navratil in Ref. [109] (N3LO-Idaho/N2LO). The two free parameters in the N2LO three-nucleon interaction model have been chosen from the combination that reproduces the $A = 3, 4$ binding energies [109].

The $A = 3$ and 4 binding energies and ground-state properties are listed in Tables 5,

Table 6. The triton binding energies B (MeV), the proton r_p and neutron r_n radii (fm), the expectation values of the kinetic energy operator $\langle T \rangle$ (MeV), the mixed-symmetry S' , P , D and $T = 3/2$ probabilities (all in %) calculated with the AV8', AV14, AV18, NJ2, ISuj, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, N3LO-Jülich, $V_{low-k,2.0}$ and $V_{low-k,3.0}$ two-nucleon interaction models, and with the AV18/UIX, CDBonn/TM (with $\Lambda_{TM} = 4.795 m_\pi$), and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO two- and three-nucleon interactions.

Potential	B	$\langle T \rangle$	r_p	r_n	$P_{S'}$	P_P	P_D	$P_{T=3/2}$
AV8'	7.767	47.605	1.642	1.807	1.273	0.067	8.579	0.0
AV14	7.684	45.678	1.667	1.828	1.126	0.076	8.967	0.0
AV18	7.624	46.727	1.653	1.824	1.293	0.066	8.510	0.0025
NJ2	7.651	47.520	1.647	1.816	1.292	0.064	8.329	0.0032
ISuj	8.475	32.950	1.568	1.715	1.433	0.026	4.776	0.0028
CDBonn	7.998	37.630	1.618	1.771	1.310	0.047	7.018	0.0049
N3LO-Idaho	7.854	34.555	1.655	1.808	1.365	0.037	6.312	0.0009
N3LO-Jülich	7.292	43.467	1.726	1.892	1.690	0.018	4.316	0.0017
$V_{low-k,2.0}$	8.597	29.509	1.574	1.713	1.330	0.018	4.062	0.0016
$V_{low-k,3.0}$	8.085	32.790	1.614	1.765	1.317	0.042	6.749	0.0020
AV18/UIX	8.479	51.275	1.582	1.732	1.054	0.135	9.301	0.0025
CDBonn/TM	8.474	39.364	1.580	1.722	1.202	0.101	6.971	0.0049
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	8.474	36.482	1.611	1.752	1.242	0.121	6.815	0.0009
Exp.	8.482		1.60					

6, 7, and 8. In Table 5, using some representative models among the ones quoted above, i.e. the AV18, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, AV18/UIX, CDBonn/TM and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO, the PHH and HH results for the triton and ^4He binding energies are compared with those ones obtained with other approaches. In particular, we have referred to the FE (for $A = 3$) and FY (for $A = 4$) approach of Refs. [108, 110, 111, 39], and the NCSM approach of Ref. [54, 56, 109].

From inspection of Table 5, we can conclude that for any of the considered realistic potential models, the agreement between the HH or PHH results and those from the other techniques here considered is excellent. Such an agreement is present for both local and non-local potentials. To be noticed that the AV18 result of Ref. [39] does not include the $T = 3/2$ contribution. Moreover, the CDBonn and CDBonn/TM results of Ref. [108] include the $n - p$ mass difference. Once this contribution is subtracted, the agreement with the other methods is quite good. In the same row of the table a recently updated result for ^4He is given in parentheses [112].

In Tables 6, 7, and 8 we present our results for the $A = 3, 4$ bound states properties, among which the expectation value of the kinetic energy, the proton and neutron radii and different occupation probabilities. In the case of inclusion of NN forces only, we notice that all the potentials, except for the ISuj model, do not reproduce the experimental trinucleon binding energy. The ISuj model has been constructed modifying the off-energy shell part of AV18 in order to reproduce the NN scattering data and also some $A = 3$ observables, as the trinucleon binding energy. This model predicts a quite

Table 7. Same as Table 6, but for ${}^3\text{He}$.

Potential	B	$\langle T \rangle$	r_p	r_n	$P_{S'}$	P_P	P_D	$P_{T=3/2}$
AV8'	7.108	46.696	1.846	1.666	1.470	0.066	8.542	0.0
AV14	7.033	44.813	1.867	1.691	1.315	0.076	8.967	0.0
AV18	6.925	45.685	1.872	1.678	1.530	0.065	8.467	0.0080
NJ2	6.994	46.607	1.857	1.668	1.491	0.063	8.282	0.0083
ISuj	7.712	32.194	1.757	1.590	1.643	0.026	4.795	0.0059
CDBonn	7.263	36.767	1.819	1.637	1.542	0.046	7.000	0.0109
N3LO-Idaho	7.128	33.789	1.855	1.675	1.607	0.037	6.313	0.0062
N3LO-Jülich	6.590	42.471	1.948	1.751	1.985	0.018	4.327	0.0095
$V_{low-k,2.0}$	7.847	28.861	1.755	1.591	1.539	0.018	4.086	0.0063
$V_{low-k,3.0}$	7.358	32.087	1.810	1.632	1.537	0.042	6.736	0.0073
AV18/UIX	7.750	50.211	1.771	1.602	1.242	0.132	9.248	0.0075
CDBonn/TM	7.720	38.495	1.767	1.597	1.409	0.099	6.966	0.0106
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	7.733	35.745	1.794	1.628	1.450	0.119	6.818	0.0057
Exp.	7.718		1.77					

low D -state probability as the models derived from χPT . The binding energy and the other quantities predicted by the V_{low-k} models depend sizably on Λ_{low-k} . Here, we have chosen two representative values of such a parameter.

In the cases in which a 3N interaction is included, the experimental binding energy is well reproduced, since one of the parameter of such a term is chosen accordingly. In all the calculations the $n - p$ mass difference contribution has not been included. This contribution can be estimated perturbatively by taking the mean value of the operator

$$K_{\Delta} = \sum_{i=1,A} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2m_p} - \frac{1}{2m_n} \right) \nabla_i^2 \tau_z(i) . \quad (118)$$

This effect has been found to be quite tiny. For example, using the AV18 interaction model, the change in binding energy of ${}^3\text{H}$, ${}^3\text{He}$, and ${}^4\text{He}$ has been found to be about +6 keV, -6 keV, and -0.15 keV, respectively [108, 65]. By inspecting the tables, it can be observed the presence of quite large differences in the occupation probabilities and the expectation value of the kinetic energy for the different models. For example, the mean value of the kinetic energy for CDBonn, ISuj, N3LO-Idaho and V_{low-k} -type potentials is noticeably smaller than that found with the AV18 or NJ2 potentials. This is due to the fact that the repulsion at short interparticle distances is softer for the former potentials than for the latter ones. Also the percentages of the P - and D -waves are significantly smaller for the former potentials. This fact has an important consequence in the application of the HH method, since for potentials with a softer repulsion at short interparticle distances the convergence is usually faster. For example, for $A = 4$, the convergence has been reached including HH states up to $G_{\max} = 80, 52, 32, 22$ for AV18, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, and V_{low-k} potential models, respectively.

The protonic radii are well reproduced by the models including a 3N interaction. To

be noticed that the ISuj and $V_{low-k,2.0}$ models, which reproduce quite well the $A = 3, 4$ binding energies with only two-body forces, tend to predict too small protonic radius. This could be related to the corresponding small D -wave percentage.

A few comments on the estimated percentages of the $T = 3/2$ and $T > 0$ components in the $A = 3$ and 4 systems are in order. For the percentage of the $T = 1$ component in the ${}^4\text{He}$ ground state wave function, 50% of it is due to the effect of the Coulomb interaction between the protons, the remaining 50% is due to the CSB terms in the nuclear interaction. This can be seen from Table 8, since the models where the CSB is absent (AV8' and AV14) predict a percentage approximately half of those calculated with AV18, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, etc., which were fitted to both pp and np data including CSB by construction. The difference in $P_{T=1}$ for these latter models is however small, due to the important role of the Coulomb interaction. On the contrary, the $T = 3/2$ component in triton and the $T = 2$ component in ${}^4\text{He}$ are largely dominated by CSB of nuclear origin (different pion masses, etc.). The values reported in Table 6 and 8 show that, depending on the interaction, rather different values for the triton $P_{T=3/2}$ and the ${}^4\text{He}$ $P_{T=2}$ are obtained (note that the standard models of 3N have little effect on the isospin admixtures [65]). The origin of the rather large differences found for the triton $P_{T=3/2}$ and the ${}^4\text{He}$ $P_{T=2}$ (a factor 5 between CDBonn and N3LO-Idaho) must be related to quite different off-shell behavior of the CSB terms of the interactions. The $T = 3/2$ component in ${}^3\text{He}$ is also affected by the Coulomb interaction, which strongly reduces the difference between the $P_{T=3/2}$ results. The knowledge of the $T = 1$ and 2 percentages is important for parity-violating electron scattering experiments on ${}^4\text{He}$, aimed at studying admixture of strange quark $s\bar{s}$ pairs in nucleons and nuclei [113, 114, 115]. A preliminary study of this important aspect has been published in Ref. [116]. It could play an important role also in the study of the reaction $d + d \rightarrow \alpha + \pi^0$. This reaction is possible only if isospin symmetry is violated, namely it probes directly the CSB terms in the nuclear Hamiltonian [117, 118].

Finally, we would like to comment on the capability of these potential models in reproducing simultaneously the $A = 3, 4$ binding energies. It is well known that there is an almost linear relation between the ${}^3\text{H}$ and ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energies. By inspection of Tables 6, 7, and 8 we observe that the models which reproduce the ${}^3\text{H}$ binding energy (ISuj, AV18/UIX, CDBonn/TM, and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO) slightly overpredict the ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energy. This overprediction is of about 0.6 MeV for ISuj and CDBonn/TM and reduces to 0.16 MeV for AV18/UIX or to 0.06 MeV for N3LO-Idaho/N2LO. Another important aspect is the correct description of the mass difference between the ${}^3\text{H}$ and ${}^3\text{He}$, directly related to the CSB components in the Hamiltonian. As already mentioned, the present calculations do not include the $n - p$ mass difference. Taking it into account together with other small contributions, as explained in Ref. [108], the AV18/UIX theoretical estimate for the mass difference D is around 750 keV, slightly smaller than the experimental one $D_{\text{exp}} = 764$ keV. The ${}^3\text{H}$ - ${}^3\text{He}$ mass difference values for the CDBonn/TM and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO models are $D = 754$ keV and 741 keV, respectively, as can be seen from Tables 6 and 7. Taking into account the $n - p$ mass

Table 8. The ${}^4\text{He}$ binding energies B (MeV), the proton r_p and neutron r_n radii (fm), the expectation values of the kinetic energy operator $\langle T \rangle$ (MeV), the P , D , $T = 1$, and $T = 2$ probabilities (all in %) calculated with the AV8', AV14, AV18, NJ2, ISuj, CDBonn, N3LO-Idaho, N3LO-Jülich, $V_{low-k,2.0}$ and $V_{low-k,3.0}$ two-nucleon interaction models, and with the AV18/UIX, CDBonn/TM (with $\Lambda_{\text{TM}} = 4.784 m_\pi$), and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO two- and three-nucleon interactions.

Potential	B	$\langle T \rangle$	r_p	r_n	P_P	P_D	$P_{T=1}$	$P_{T=2}$
AV8'	24.90	98.80	1.507	1.502	0.408	14.50	0.0013	0.0001
AV14	24.23	95.76	1.526	1.521	0.393	14.41	0.0013	0.0001
AV18	24.21	97.84	1.514	1.509	0.347	13.74	0.0028	0.0052
NJ2	24.42	100.27	1.506	1.501	0.334	13.37	0.0016	0.0074
ISuj	28.97	68.66	1.383	1.378	0.097	6.10	0.0020	0.0072
CDBonn	26.13	77.58	1.458	1.453	0.223	10.74	0.0029	0.0108
N3LO-Idaho	25.38	69.24	1.518	1.513	0.172	9.29	0.0035	0.0024
N3LO-Jülich	22.20	86.85	1.636	1.631	0.081	6.22	0.0065	0.0063
$V_{low-k,2.0}$	29.66	60.77	1.389	1.384	0.064	4.69	0.0020	0.0023
$V_{low-k,3.0}$	26.57	65.68	1.455	1.450	0.201	10.04	0.0025	0.0038
AV18/UIX	28.46	113.30	1.430	1.425	0.732	16.03	0.0025	0.0050
CDBonn/TM	29.00	84.56	1.396	1.391	0.454	9.94	0.0021	0.0105
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	28.36	74.93	1.476	1.471	0.608	10.79	0.0028	0.0020
Exp.	28.30		1.47					

difference contribution (≈ 12 keV), it can be seen that the CDBonn/TM well reproduces D_{exp} , whereas the N3LO-Idaho/N2LO model gives a slightly smaller value. For the ISuj model, the value $D = 763$ keV coincides with D_{exp} . To be noticed that additional contributions could come from CSB terms in the 3N interaction. However, the 3N models considered in the present analysis do not contain terms which violate isospin symmetry.

6.3. $A = 3$ and 4 Scattering States

The $A = 3$ and 4 zero-energy scattering states have been studied with the following interaction models: the two-nucleon AV14, AV18 and N3LO-Idaho, and the two- and three-nucleon AV18/UIX and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO models. In a consistent calculation of the $A = 3, 4$ scattering lengths, the electromagnetic interaction cannot be disregarded. In particular, the magnetic moment interaction gives contribution in processes in which the incident nucleon is either a proton or a neutron. In the first case, besides the Coulomb and the magnetic moment interactions, other contributions of long range as vacuum polarization and two-photon-exchange are present. The treatment of these terms remains outside the aims of the present work. Accordingly, in the description of pd and $p^3\text{He}$, we consider only the point Coulomb interaction and, in some cases, the magnetic moment interaction too.

The results for the nd and pd doublet and quartet scattering lengths are given in

Tables 9 and 10 and are compared with those obtained by other techniques [119, 120] and the available experimental data [121, 122]. The pd calculation has been performed with and without the inclusion of the $T = 3/2$ components of the wave function (see Eq. (102)). Furthermore, we performed two different calculations using the AV18 potential since, by construction, it includes the long range electromagnetic terms. In the nd case, the results labelled as AV18* do not include these terms. In the pd case the AV18* results include only the point Coulomb interaction, whereas those labelled as AV18 include the complete electromagnetic potential with the exception of the two-photon exchange and the vacuum polarization terms. The calculations have been performed with the PHH expansion in the $A = 3$ case with local potential models, and with the HH expansion in all other cases. The dimension of the basis and the number of the integration points have been increased in order to reach an accuracy of 0.002 fm in the calculation of the scattering lengths.

From inspection of the tables we can conclude that: (i) both the nd and pd quartet scattering lengths are almost model-independent. (ii) The nd doublet scattering length $^2a_{nd}$ is very sensitive to the choice of the two-nucleon potential model, when no 3N interaction is included. Once the 3N interaction is included, and therefore the triton binding energy is well reproduced, $^2a_{nd}$ becomes little model-dependent. This is a well-known feature, related to the fact that $^2a_{nd}$ and the triton binding energy are linearly correlated (the so-called Phillips line [123]). (iii) The pd doublet scattering length $^2a_{pd}$ is positive and quite model-dependent, if only the two-nucleon interaction is included. Once the three-nucleon interaction is added, $^2a_{pd}$ becomes small. Some model-dependence remains, but the problem of extrapolating to zero energy the experimental results makes very difficult any meaningful comparison between theory and experiment. (iv) The nd quartet scattering length $^4a_{nd}$ is in very good agreement with the experimental data. Conversely, some disagreement is observed in the doublet scattering length $^2a_{nd}$ for most of the NN plus 3N interactions considered. The results presented have been calculated without including the neutron-proton mass difference. This contribution will further decrease the value of $^2a_{nd}$. To be noticed that a recent measurement [122] of the coherent nd scattering length predicts $^2a_{nd} = [0.645 \pm 0.003(\text{expt}) \pm 0.007(\text{theory})]$ fm. This very precise measurement is not well described by any of the potential models analyzed in this section, with the exception of the N3LO-Idaho/N2LO.

The results for the $n^3\text{H}$ and $p^3\text{He}$ singlet and triplet scattering lengths are given in Table 11 and are compared with other theoretical calculations, performed using the FY equations method [39, 111], and the available experimental data [124, 125, 126, 127]. For $n^3\text{H}$, the scattering lengths can be obtained from the experimental values of the total cross section σ_T and the coherent scattering length a_c ,

$$\sigma_T = \pi(|^1a|^2 + 3|^3a|^2) , \quad a_c = \frac{1}{4}^1a + \frac{3}{4}^3a . \quad (119)$$

The $n^3\text{H}$ cross section has been accurately measured over a wide energy range and the extrapolation to zero energy does not present any problem. The value obtained is

Table 9. The nd doublet and quartet scattering lengths $^2a_{nd}$, $^4a_{nd}$, in fm, are calculated with the AV14, AV18, AV18*, and N3LO-Idaho two-nucleon interaction models, and with the AV14/TM (with $\Lambda_{\text{TM}} = 5.13 m_\pi$), AV18/UIX, AV18*/UIX, and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO two- and three-nucleon interactions, and are compared with the results obtained with the FE technique [119, 120] and the available experimental data [121, 122].

Potential	Method	$^2a_{nd}$	$^4a_{nd}$
AV14	PHH	1.189	6.379
AV14	FE [119]	1.204	6.380
AV18	PHH	1.258	6.345
AV18	FE [120]	1.248	6.346
AV18*	PHH	1.275	6.325
AV18*	FE [120]	1.263	6.326
N3LO-Idaho	HH	1.100	6.342
AV14/TM	PHH	0.586	6.371
AV18/UIX	PHH	0.590	6.343
AV18/UIX	FE [120]	0.578	6.347
AV18*/UIX	PHH	0.610	6.323
AV18*/UIX	FE [120]	0.597	6.326
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	HH	0.675	6.342
Exp. [121]		0.65 ± 0.04	6.35 ± 0.02
Exp. [122]		$0.645 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.007$	

Table 10. Same as Table 9 but for pd . Also listed are the results obtained without the inclusion of the $T = 3/2$ component in the wave functions ($^2a_{pd}(T = 1/2)$ and $^4a_{pd}(T = 1/2)$).

Potential	Method	$^2a_{pd}$	$^4a_{pd}$	$^2a_{pd}(T = 1/2)$	$^4a_{pd}(T = 1/2)$
AV14	PHH	0.937	13.773	0.941	13.773
AV14	FE [119]			0.965	13.764
AV18	PHH	1.134	13.662	1.150	13.662
AV18*	PHH	1.185	13.588	1.198	13.589
N3LO-Idaho	HH	0.876	13.646	0.866	13.646
AV18/UIX	PHH	-0.089	13.662	-0.074	13.663
AV18*/UIX	PHH	-0.035	13.588	-0.019	13.590
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	HH	0.072	13.647	0.082	13.647

$\sigma_T = [1.70 \pm 0.03]$ b [128]. The coherent scattering length has been measured by neutron-interferometry techniques. The most recent values reported in the literature are $a_c = [3.59 \pm 0.02]$ fm [124] and $a_c = [3.607 \pm 0.017]$ fm, the latter value being obtained from $p^3\text{He}$ data using an approximate Coulomb-corrected R-matrix theory [125]. However, in the $^1a\text{-}^3a$ plane, the ellipse defined by the total cross section and corresponding to the experimental value of $\sigma_T = 1.70$ b and the straight line corresponding to the coherent scattering length $a_c \approx 3.6$ fm are almost tangent. Therefore, a small change in the

a_c value produces a large variation of 1a and 3a . This is also the reason for the large uncertainty in the values reported in Table 11.

Note that there is a fairly good agreement between the results of the various theoretical calculations. The calculated scattering lengths show a scaling behaviour with respect to the ^3H binding energy similar to the Phillips line, as discussed in Ref. [72]. The total cross sections obtained with the AV18/UIX and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO models are 1.73 b and 1.68 b, in agreement with the experimental value. The theoretical coherent scattering lengths are 3.73 fm and 3.65 fm, respectively, at variance with respect to the experimental value. The origin of this discrepancy is still unclear.

For $p^3\text{He}$, scattering length measurements were reported in Refs. [126, 127]. However, these have rather large errors. In fact, the $p^3\text{He}$ data have been extrapolated to zero energy from measurements taken above 1 MeV, and therefore suffer of large systematic uncertainties.

Table 11. The $n^3\text{H}$, $p^3\text{He}$ singlet and triplet scattering lengths $^1a_{n^3\text{H}}$, $^3a_{n^3\text{H}}$, $^1a_{p^3\text{He}}$, $^3a_{p^3\text{He}}$, in fm, are calculated with the AV18, and N3LO-Idaho two-nucleon interaction models, and with the AV18/UIX and N3LO-Idaho/N2LO two- and three-nucleon interactions. The available results from the FY equations method [39, 111] and the available experimental data [124, 125, 126, 127] are also reported.

Potential	Method	$^1a_{n^3\text{H}}$	$^3a_{n^3\text{H}}$	$^1a_{p^3\text{He}}$	$^3a_{p^3\text{He}}$
AV18	HH	4.29	3.73	12.9	10.0
AV18	FY [39]	4.27	3.71		
AV18	FY [111]	4.28	3.71		
N3LO-Idaho	HH	4.20	3.67	11.5	9.2
N3LO-Idaho	FY [111]	4.23	3.67		
AV18/UIX	HH	4.10	3.61	11.5	9.1
AV18/UIX	FY [39]	4.04	3.60		
N3LO-Idaho/N2LO	HH	3.99	3.54	11.0	8.6
Exp. [124]		4.98 ± 0.29	3.13 ± 0.11		
Exp. [125]		4.45 ± 0.10	3.32 ± 0.02		
Exp. [126]				10.8 ± 2.6	8.1 ± 0.5
Exp. [127]					10.2 ± 1.5

7. Summary and Conclusions

In this article we have presented a theoretical approach suitable to describe with high precision bound states and zero-energy scattering states for the $A = 3, 4$ nucleon systems. A particular attention has been given to the presentation of the various models available for the two- and three-body nuclear interaction. In fact, in recent times, different NN and 3N interactions have been proposed and applied by many authors to the study of few-nucleon systems. The capability of these interactions to describe all the complexity of the nuclear dynamics is at present an intense subject of research. Bound

states and low-energy scattering states are the first structures to be examined using the interaction models under consideration. To this aim, any reliable technique employed should allow for meaningful comparison with the available experimental data. In other words, the solution of the Schrödinger equation should be accurate enough in order to eliminate uncertainties in the theoretical predictions.

The method discussed in this paper is based on the expansion of the wave function over the HH functions and the solution of the Schrödinger equation is obtained by using a variational principle. Nowadays computing facilities make it possible to consider very large sets of HH functions, so that the problem of convergence can be carefully studied for specific observables as binding energies or scattering lengths. Several papers [61, 62, 65, 67, 68] have been devoted to applying and verifying this approach for different systems, and the obtained results have been successfully compared to those of other accurate techniques.

There are two main motivations behind the present work. The first one is to highlight the details of the HH method and its capability and accuracy in studying $A = 3$ and 4 nuclear systems. The extension to larger A -values is an important problem and studies in this direction are currently in progress. The second motivation is that the results presented here for different types of interaction models should turn out to provide a useful comparison for other available or future techniques. The main merit of the HH method is that it can be implemented to treat the $A = 3, 4$ systems with interactions given in configuration or in momentum space including the electromagnetic potential. In particular, the description of low-energy scattering states with charged particles does not arise particular difficulties and, in fact, the HH technique has been applied successfully for the description of the pd capture reaction [77, 80] and the $p^3\text{He}$ weak capture reaction [78, 79] in the keV region.

From the results here presented we can conclude that there are some problems, not yet completely solved, in the theoretical description of the $A = 3, 4$ systems. The simultaneous reproduction of the ^3H , ^3He and ^4He binding energies is not totally satisfactory. Several combinations of modern NN plus 3N interaction models tend to overestimate the α -particle binding energy, once the 3N interaction strength has been fixed to reproduce the triton binding energy. The nucleons in the α -particle are in average very close to each other, so that a greater sensitivity to 3N interaction terms should be manifested in this system. The N2LO 3N interaction model in conjunction with the N3LO-Idaho NN interaction gives the better description of the three binding energies mentioned above. This model contains a number of operators very similar to those present in the TM and UIX model, but having different relative strengths. The overestimation given by the CDBonn/TM potential is appreciable, suggesting that a further analysis of the TM model could be useful.

Another problem is the underestimation of the nd doublet scattering length by all the models considered except the N3LO-Idaho/N2LO. A high precision measurement of the coherent nd scattering length is available and, from this quantity, the nd doublet scattering length can be evaluated. This has been done using the theoretical estimates

for the nd quartet scattering length since this quantity results to be almost model independent. In any case, after considering the theoretical uncertainty introduced, the theoretical estimates given in Table 9 are lower with respect to the mean experimental value by 5 % to 10 %. This is not the case for the N3LO-Idaho/N2LO potential. It seems that this model is the only one among those studied here able to reproduce simultaneously the experimental values of the $A = 3$ and 4 binding energies and the $A = 3$ scattering lengths.

Although many efforts have been done, and are still in progress, for a more accurate determination of the nuclear interaction, a long way seems to be in front of us. To this aim, the extension of the HH method to treat systems with $A > 4$ and scattering states at medium and high energies will be very useful. Intense efforts are pursued in this directions by the authors.

Appendix A. The Transformation Coefficients for $A = 3$

Let us discuss how to compute the transformation coefficients (TC) for $A = 3$. It is convenient to start from Eq. (70), which can be written as

$$a_{\ell_1 \ell_2 n_2, \ell'_1 \ell'_2 n'_2}^{(p), G, L} = \int d\Omega_2 \left[{}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell'_1 \ell'_2 n'_2\}, LM}(\Omega_2) \right]^\dagger {}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1 \ell_2 n_2\}, LM}(\Omega_2^{(p)}) , \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where the functions ${}^{(3)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1 \ell_2 n_2\}, LM}(\Omega_2)$ are defined in Eq. (53). First of all, let us recall the following identity satisfied by the spherical harmonics

$$c^\ell Y_{\ell, m}(\hat{c}) = \sum_{\ell_a + \ell_b = \ell} a^{\ell_a} b^{\ell_b} \sqrt{4\pi} D_{\ell, \ell_a, \ell_b} \left[Y_{\ell_a}(\hat{a}) Y_{\ell_b}(\hat{b}) \right]_{\ell, m} , \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the vector variables are related by $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}$ and

$$D_{\ell, \ell_a, \ell_b} = \sqrt{\frac{(2\ell + 1)!}{(\ell_a + 1)!(\ell_b + 1)!}} . \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The Jacobi vectors constructed with permutation p are linearly related to the Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ for the permutation 1 (corresponding to the order 1, 2, 3 of the particles), namely

$$\mathbf{x}_i^{(p)} = \sum_{j=1,2} \alpha_{ij}^{(p)} \mathbf{x}_j , \quad i = 1, 2 , \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where $\alpha_{ij}^{(p)}$ are numerical coefficients. It can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} (\sin \varphi_2^{(p)})^{\ell_1} (\cos \varphi_2^{(p)})^{\ell_2} \left[Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1^{(p)}) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2^{(p)}) \right]_{L, M} = \\ \sum_{\ell'_1 \ell'_2} C_{\ell_1 \ell_2, \ell'_1 \ell'_2}^{(p)} (\sin \varphi_2, \cos \varphi_2) [Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2)]_{L, M} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$C_{\ell_1 \ell_2, \ell'_1 \ell'_2}^{(p)}(x, y) = \sum_{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \ell_1} \sum_{\lambda'_1 + \lambda'_2 = \ell_2} x^{\lambda_1 + \lambda'_1} y^{\lambda_2 + \lambda'_2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \times (\alpha_{11}^{(p)})^{\lambda_1} (\alpha_{12}^{(p)})^{\lambda_2} (\alpha_{21}^{(p)})^{\lambda'_1} (\alpha_{22}^{(p)})^{\lambda'_2} \\
& \times D_{\ell_1, \lambda_1, \lambda_2} D_{\ell_2, \lambda'_1, \lambda'_2} (-)^{\lambda_1 + \lambda'_1 + \lambda_2 + \lambda'_2} \hat{\ell}_1 \hat{\ell}_2 \hat{\ell}'_1 \hat{\ell}'_2 \hat{\lambda}_1 \hat{\lambda}_2 \hat{\lambda}'_1 \hat{\lambda}'_2 \\
& \times \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda'_1 & \ell'_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & \lambda'_2 & \ell'_2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \left\{ \begin{matrix} \lambda_1 & \lambda_2 & \ell_1 \\ \lambda'_1 & \lambda'_2 & \ell_2 \\ \ell'_1 & \ell'_2 & L \end{matrix} \right\}, \quad (\text{A.6})
\end{aligned}$$

and $\hat{\ell} = \sqrt{2\ell + 1}$.

The integrand in Eq. (A.1) depends on the angular variables $\hat{x}_1$ and $\hat{x}_2$ through the spherical harmonics and the argument $\cos 2\varphi_2^{(p)}$ of the Jacobi polynomial, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\cos 2\varphi_2^{(p)} = 2 \Big[& (\alpha_{21}^{(p)})^2 (\sin \varphi_2)^2 + (\alpha_{22}^{(p)})^2 (\cos \varphi_2)^2 \\
& + 2\alpha_{21}^{(p)} \alpha_{22}^{(p)} \mu \sin \varphi_2 \cos \varphi_2 \Big] - 1, \quad (\text{A.7})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mu = \hat{x}_1 \cdot \hat{x}_2$. It is possible to perform analytically part of the angular integration (keeping μ fixed) with the result

$$\begin{aligned}
\int d\hat{x}_1 d\hat{x}_2 [Y_{\ell'_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell'_2}(\hat{x}_2)]_{L,M}^\dagger [Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2)]_{L,M} = \\
\sum_{\lambda} A_{\lambda}^{\ell'_1 \ell'_2 \ell_1 \ell_2, L} \frac{1}{2} \int d\mu P_{\lambda}(\mu),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{\lambda}^{\ell'_1 \ell'_2 \ell_1 \ell_2, L} = & (-)^{L + \ell_2 + \ell'_2} \hat{\ell}_1 \hat{\ell}_2 \hat{\ell}'_1 \hat{\ell}'_2 (2\lambda + 1) \\
& \times \left\{ \begin{matrix} \ell'_1 & \ell'_2 & L \\ \ell_2 & \ell_1 & \lambda \end{matrix} \right\} \begin{pmatrix} \ell'_1 & \ell_1 & \lambda \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \ell'_2 & \ell_2 & \lambda \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.8})
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Eqs. (A.6) and (A.8), we arrive at the expression for the TC

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\ell_1 \ell_2 n_2, \ell'_1 \ell'_2 n'_2}^{(p), G, L} = & \mathcal{N}_{n'_2}^{\ell'_2, \nu_2} \mathcal{N}_{n_2}^{\ell_2, \nu_2} \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\pi/2} d\varphi_2 \int_{-1}^{+1} d\mu (\cos \varphi_2)^{2+\ell'_2} (\sin \varphi_2)^{2+\ell'_1} \\
& \times P_{n'_2}^{\ell'_1+1/2, \ell'_2+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_2) P_{n_2}^{\ell_1+1/2, \ell_2+1/2}(\cos 2\varphi_2^{(p)}) \\
& \times \sum_{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda} C_{\ell_1 \ell_2, \lambda_1 \lambda_2}^{(p)}(\sin \varphi_2, \cos \varphi_2) A_{\lambda}^{\ell'_1 \ell'_2 \lambda_1 \lambda_2, L} P_{\lambda}(\mu), \quad (\text{A.9})
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{n_2}^{\ell_2, \nu_2}$ is given in Eq. (34) and $\nu_2 = G + 2$. This integral can be calculated easily using Gauss quadrature, since it is a polynomial in μ , $\cos \varphi_2$ and $\sin \varphi_2$.

Appendix B. The Transformation Coefficients for $A = 4$

Let us now consider the calculation of the transformation coefficients (TC) for $A = 4$ ($N = 3$) for a generic permutation p of the particles. In the following, the hypervariables constructed starting from a generic choice of the Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}$, $\mathbf{x}_2^{(p)}$, $\mathbf{x}_3^{(p)}$, corresponding to the permutation p of the particles and either set A or B (see Eq. (6)), will be denoted by $\Omega_3^{(p)}$. We will also consider the hyperangular variables Ω_3 constructed

in terms of a reference set of Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$ corresponding for example to those defined in set A and to the order 1, 2, 3, 4 of the particles. Let us define

$$y_p = \cos 2\phi_2^{(p)}, \quad z_p = \cos 2\phi_3^{(p)}, \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where the hyperangles $\phi_2^{(p)}, \phi_3^{(p)}$ are defined in Eq. (8) in terms of the moduli of the Jacobi vectors. In terms of these variables, the expression of a generic $A = 4$ HH function is

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3\}, LM}^G(\Omega_3^{(p)}) &= \left[\left(Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1^{(p)}) Y_{\ell_2}(\hat{x}_2^{(p)}) \right)_{L_2} Y_{\ell_3}(\hat{x}_3^{(p)}) \right]_{LM} \\ &\times \mathcal{N}_{n_2, n_3}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3} (1 - y_p)^{\frac{\ell_1}{2}} (1 + y_p)^{\frac{\ell_2}{2}} \\ &\times (1 - z_p)^{\frac{\ell_1 + \ell_2 + 2n_2}{2}} (1 + z_p)^{\frac{\ell_3}{2}} \\ &\times P_{n_2}^{\ell_1 + \frac{1}{2}, \ell_2 + \frac{1}{2}}(y_p) P_{n_3}^{\ell_1 + \ell_2 + 2n_2 + 2, \ell_3 + \frac{1}{2}}(z_p), \quad (\text{B.2}) \end{aligned}$$

where the normalization factor is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_{n_2, n_3}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3} &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{\ell_1 + \ell_2 + n_2 + \frac{\ell_3}{2}} \\ &\times \prod_{j=2}^3 \left[\frac{2\nu_j \Gamma(\nu_j - n_j) n_j!}{\Gamma(\nu_j - n_j - \ell_j - 1/2) \Gamma(n_j + \ell_j + 3/2)} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (\text{B.3}) \end{aligned}$$

with $\nu_j = G_j + (3j - 5)/2$ and G_j defined in Eq. (30). The superscript G in Eq. (B.2) has been inserted to remember that the possible choices of the quantum numbers $\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3\}$ are restricted to the case $\ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3 + 2(n_2 + n_3) = G$.

Let us start with the state having quantum numbers $n_2 = n_3 = 0$ ($G = G_m = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3$). Since the values of G_m to be considered are small, the TC for this state can be easily calculated by means of any of the methods proposed in the literature. For example, one can employ the technique of Ref. [129]. This method is based on the fact that Eq. (69) has to be verified for any spatial configuration of the Jacobi vectors set $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$. For given values of G and L , the sum in the right-hand side of Eq. (69) is over N_{GL} terms. If the equation is required to be satisfied for N_{GL} values of the set $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}$, one gets a system of N_{GL} linear equation for the required TC. The HH functions we are interested in have $G = G_m = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + \ell_3 \leq 6$, therefore the number N_{GL} of linear equations is small and a standard numerical technique can be employed.

The Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_1^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_2^{(p)}, \mathbf{x}_3^{(p)}$ are linearly related to the Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \mathbf{x}_3$, hence the following relations hold

$$(x_3^{(p)})^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \Gamma_{ij}^{(p)} \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (x_2^{(p)})^2 = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \Delta_{ij}^{(p)} \mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_j, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

where the numerical coefficients $\Gamma_{ij}^{(p)}$ and $\Delta_{ij}^{(p)}$ can be easily computed by expressing the vectors $\mathbf{x}_3^{(p)}$ and $\mathbf{x}_2^{(p)}$ in terms of $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2$ and $\mathbf{x}_3$.

Let us now assume to know the TC for the HH functions ${}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3\}, LM}^G(\Omega_3^{(p)})$ in terms of the HH functions constructed with Ω_3 , namely

$${}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3\}, LM}^G(\Omega_3^{(p)}) = \sum_{\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3} a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3; \ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3}^{(p), G, L}$$

$$\times {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3\}, LM}^G(\Omega_3) . \quad (\text{B.5})$$

It is important to note that the sum over $\{\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3\}$ is restricted by the condition $\ell'_1 + \ell'_2 + \ell'_3 + 2(n'_2 + n'_3) = G$. This can be understood from the fact that $\rho^G \times {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}^G$ is a harmonic polynomial of degree G . The transformation given in Eq. (B.4) clearly cannot change the degree of such a polynomial and therefore ${}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}^G(\Omega_3^{(p)})$ can be expressed only in terms of HH functions with the same G . Also the transformation (B.4) is equivalent to a rotation, and therefore L, M cannot change and the TC cannot depend on M .

Let us consider first the function ${}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3+1\}, LM}^{G+2}(\Omega_3^{(p)})$. Using the expression of the Jacobi polynomials $P_{n_3+1}(z_p)$ in terms of $P_{n_3}(z_p)$ and $P_{n_3-1}(z_p)$, one obtains

$$a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3+1; \ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3}^{(p), G+2, L} = 2b_{n_3} \sum_{\ell''_1, \ell''_2, \ell''_3, L''_2, n''_2, n''_3} a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3; \ell''_1, \ell''_2, \ell''_3, L''_2, n''_2, n''_3}^{(p), G, L} \sum_{i,j=1}^3 \Gamma_{i,j}^{(p)} I_{i,j} , \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where

$$b_{n_3} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{n_2, n_3+1}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_2, n_3}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}} \frac{(2n_3 + \alpha_3 + \beta_3 + 1)(2n_3 + \alpha_3 + \beta_3 + 2)}{2(n_3 + 1)(n_3 + \alpha_3 + \beta_3 + 1)} , \quad (\text{B.7})$$

and $\alpha_3 = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + 2n_2 + 2$, $\beta_3 = \ell_3 + 1/2$. The terms $I_{i,j}$, $i, j = 1, 3$ are defined by

$$I_{i,j} = \int d\Omega_3 \left[{}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3\}, LM}^{G+2}(\Omega_3) \right]^\dagger \frac{\mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_j}{\rho^2} \times {}^{(4)}\mathcal{H}_{\{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, n_3\}, LM}^G(\Omega_3) , \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where $d\Omega_3$ is given by

$$d\Omega_3 = \frac{1}{128\sqrt{2}} d\hat{x}_1 d\hat{x}_2 d\hat{x}_3 dy dz (1-y)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1+y)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1-z)^2 (1+z)^{\frac{1}{2}} , \quad (\text{B.9})$$

and $y = \cos 2\phi_2$, $z = \cos 2\phi_3$. The integrals $I_{i,j}$ involve only functions constructed within the same set of Jacobi vectors $\mathbf{x}_i$, $i = 1, 3$. Moreover, the factors $(\mathbf{x}_i \cdot \mathbf{x}_j)/\rho^2$, have the following expressions in terms of the hyperangular variables $\Omega_3 \equiv (\hat{x}_1, \hat{x}_2, \hat{x}_3, y, z)$ (remember that $x_3 = \rho \cos \varphi_3$, etc),

$$i, j = 1, 1 , \quad \frac{x_1^2}{\rho^2} = \frac{(1-y)(1-z)}{4} , \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$i, j = 2, 2 , \quad \frac{x_2^2}{\rho^2} = \frac{(1+y)(1-z)}{4} , \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$i, j = 3, 3 , \quad \frac{x_3^2}{\rho^2} = \frac{1+z}{2} , \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$i, j = 1, 2 , \quad \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_2}{\rho^2} = -\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{(1-z)\sqrt{1-y^2}}{4} [Y_1(\hat{x}_1)Y_1(\hat{x}_2)]_{0,0} , \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$i, j = 1, 3 , \quad \frac{\mathbf{x}_1 \cdot \mathbf{x}_3}{\rho^2} = -\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\sqrt{1-z^2}\sqrt{1-y}}{2\sqrt{2}} [Y_1(\hat{x}_1)Y_1(\hat{x}_3)]_{0,0} , \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$i, j = 2, 3 , \quad \frac{\mathbf{x}_2 \cdot \mathbf{x}_3}{\rho^2} = -\frac{4\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\sqrt{1-z^2}\sqrt{1+y}}{2\sqrt{2}} [Y_1(\hat{x}_2)Y_1(\hat{x}_3)]_{0,0} . \quad (\text{B.15})$$

Therefore, the integrals $I_{i,j}$ reduces to products of simple integrals of the kind

$$I_1[\ell', m', \ell, m, \ell'', m''] = \int d\hat{x} [Y_{\ell'm'}(\hat{x})]^* Y_{\ell m}(\hat{x}) Y_{\ell''m''}(\hat{x}) , \quad (\text{B.16})$$

and

$$I_2[a, b, c, d, e, f, n, m] = \int_{-1}^{+1} dx (1-x)^a (1+x)^b P_n^{c,d}(x) P_m^{e,f}(x) , \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where the non-negative numerical coefficients $a, \dots, f$ are integers or half-integers and $P_n^{c,d}(x)$, $P_m^{e,f}(x)$ are Jacobi polynomials. Such integrals can be calculated analytically, or by using simple quadrature formulas (for more details, see the appendix of Ref. [85]).

Eq. (B.6) can be used to evaluate the transformation coefficients of the HH functions with grand angular momentum $G+2$ and $n_3 > 0$, once those corresponding to G are known. For the HH function with $n_3 = 0$ one needs another recurrence formula, obtained from that one applied to the HH function with $n_3 = 0$, $n_2 + 1$. By proceeding as in the previous case, one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2+1, 0; \ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3}^{(p), G+2, L} &= c'_{n_2} A_{n_2} a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2-1, 2; \ell'_1, \ell'_2, \ell'_3, L'_2, n'_2, n'_3}^{(p), G+2, L} \\ &+ \sum_{\ell''_1, \ell''_2, \ell''_3, L''_2, n''_2, n''_3} a_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, L_2, n_2, 0; \ell''_1, \ell''_2, \ell''_3, L''_2, n''_2, n''_3}^{(p), G, L} \\ &\times \left[4b'_{n_2} \Delta_{ij}^{(p)} + 2(b'_{n_2} - a'_{n_2}) \Gamma_{ij}^{(p)} \right] I_{i,j} , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

where

$$A_{n_2} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{n_2+1,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_2-1,2}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}} \frac{8}{(1 + \alpha_3 + \beta_3)(2 + \alpha_3 + \beta_3)} , \quad (\text{B.19})$$

$$a'_{n_2} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{n_2+1,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_2,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}} \frac{(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 1)(\alpha_2^2 - \beta_2^2)}{2(n_2 + 1)(n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 1)(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2)} , \quad (\text{B.20})$$

$$b'_{n_2} = \frac{\mathcal{N}_{n_2+1,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_2,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}} \frac{(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 1)(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 2)}{2(n_2 + 1)(n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 1)} , \quad (\text{B.21})$$

$$\begin{aligned} c'_{n_2} &= - \frac{\mathcal{N}_{n_2+1,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}}{\mathcal{N}_{n_2-1,0}^{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3}} \frac{(n_2 + \alpha_2)(n_2 + \beta_2)(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 2)}{(n_2 + 1)(n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2 + 1)(2n_2 + \alpha_2 + \beta_2)} \\ &\times (1 - \delta_{n_2,0}) , \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.22})$$

with $\alpha_2 = \ell_1 + 1/2$ and $\beta_2 = \ell_2 + 1/2$.

In practice, the recurrence relations are used as follows. After the calculation of the TC for the function with $(n_2 = 0, n_3 = 0)$, those of the state $(0, 1)$ are obtained by Eq. (B.6) and those of the state $(1, 0)$ by Eq. (B.18). It can be noticed that, in the latter case, the term proportional to A_{n_2} does not contribute, as $c'_{n_2=0} = 0$. Then, Eq. (B.6) is used again for calculating the TC of the states $(0, 2)$ and $(1, 1)$. The coefficients of the state $(2, 0)$ can be now derived from Eq. (B.18), since those of the state $(0, 2)$, entering that expression, are already available. The procedure can then be continued for larger values of (n_2, n_3) .

Appendix C. The Correlation Factors

The correlation factors in Eqs. (83) and (85) have the Jastrow form, namely they are products of one-dimensional functions. Therefore, for each channel a few functions need to be chosen. One possibility would be to determine them by some preliminary variational procedure, as in Ref. [130] for a simplified problem (central interaction). However, such an approach would be numerically very involved and the following simpler procedure is preferred.

In a generic nuclear system, when all the remaining particles are far from a given pair, the dependence of the total wave function on the coordinates of the pair of particles is mainly determined by their mutual interaction. Therefore, the radial wave function of the relative motion of the i, j pair in the angular-spin state $\beta \equiv {}^{2S_{\beta}+1}(\ell_{\beta})_{j_{\beta}}$, can be approximately described by the solution of an equation of the form

$$\sum_{\beta'} \left\{ -\frac{\hbar^2}{m} \left[\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{2}{r} \frac{d}{dr} - \frac{\ell_{\beta}(\ell_{\beta}+1)}{r^2} \right] \delta_{\beta\beta'} + V_{\beta\beta'}(r) + \lambda_{\beta\beta'}(r) \right\} \phi_{\beta'}(r) = 0, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where $V_{\beta\beta'}(r) = \langle \beta' | V(i, j) | \beta \rangle$ and $V(i, j)$ is the interparticle potential. Depending on the quantum numbers, the state β can be a single state or coupled to other ones. The additional term $\lambda_{\beta\beta'}(r)$ in Eq. (C.1) has the role of simulating the average effect on the pair from the other particles. There is a large arbitrariness in choosing $\lambda_{\beta\beta'}(r)$, since the important condition to be satisfied is $|\lambda_{\beta\beta'}(r)| \ll |V_{\beta\beta'}(r)|$ when r is small. In Ref. [92], it was found that a satisfactory choice is

$$\lambda_{\beta\beta'}(r) = \Lambda_{\beta} \exp(-cr) \delta_{\beta\beta'}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

The value of $1/c$ should be greater than the range of the potential $V_{\beta\beta'}(r)$, but its precise value has been found to be unimportant (the value adopted is $1/c = 2.0$ fm). The depth Λ_{β} is then fixed so that $\phi_{\beta}(r)$ satisfy some appropriate healing condition. In this work, we have chosen $\phi_{\beta}(r) \rightarrow r^{\ell_{\beta}}$ when $r \rightarrow \infty$. The functions $\phi_{\beta}(r)/r^{\ell_{\beta}}$ have been used to construct the appropriate correlation factor F_{α} for a given channel α .

Let us consider first the $A = 3$ case. The functions $f_{\alpha}(r)$ are related to the reference pair (i, j) characterized by definite values of the angular momentum, spin and isospin for each channel; therefore these functions can be taken as solutions of Eq. (C.1). However, since the total wave function has been constructed in the LS -coupling scheme, in general the total angular momentum j_p of the reference pair has not a definite value. For the first three channels of Table 1, such a problem does not exist; in fact, $\ell_1 = 0$ and, since $J = 1/2$, one has $j_p = S_{a\alpha}$. As a consequence, the correlations f_{α} , $\alpha = 1, 3$, correspond to the states 3S_1 , 1S_0 and 3D_1 , respectively. The channels with $\alpha > 3$ have a minor relevance to produce the structure of the system than the first three ones. Therefore, we have chosen $f_{\alpha}(r) = \phi_{{}^3S_1}(r)$ for the channels with $\ell_2 = 0$, $S_{a\alpha} = 1$, $T_{a\alpha} = 0$, $f_{\alpha}(r) = \phi_{{}^1S_0}(r)$ for the channels with $\ell_2 = 0$, $S_{a\alpha} = 0$, $T_{a\alpha} = 1$, and $f_{\alpha}(r) = \phi_{{}^3D_1}(r)/r^2$ for the channels with $\ell_2 = 2$, $S_{a\alpha} = 1$, $T_{a\alpha} = 0$. Furthermore, for the channels with $\ell_2 = 1$, we have used the solution of Eq. (C.1) by taking into account only the central part of the pair potential in the state 3P . Finally, for the PHH expansion, $g_{\alpha}(r) = 1$,

Table C1. Correlation functions for the 22 channels used for the CHH expansion of the ground state of the four-nucleon system. The functions $f_1 = \phi_{3S_1}$, $f_2 = \phi_{1S_0}$, $f_3 = \phi_{3D_1}/r^2$, and $f_4 = \phi_{3P_1}/r$ are the solutions of Eq. (C.1) for the state $\beta \equiv {}^{2S+1}L_j$. The function $\bar{\phi}$ is calculated as explained in the text.

α	set	ℓ_1	ℓ_2	ℓ_3	ℓ_{12}	L	S_a	S_b	S	T_a	T_b	T	f_a	f_b	f_c	f_d
1	A	0	0	0	0	0	1	1/2	0	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
2	A	0	0	0	0	0	0	1/2	0	1	1/2	0	f_2	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
3	A	0	0	2	0	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
4	A	0	2	0	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
5	A	0	2	2	2	0	1	1/2	0	0	1/2	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
6	A	0	2	2	2	1	1	1/2	1	0	1/2	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
7	A	0	2	2	2	1	1	3/2	1	0	1/2	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
8	A	0	2	2	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
9	B	2	0	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_3
10	B	2	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_3
11	B	2	0	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_3
12	A	0	1	1	1	0	1	1/2	0	1	1/2	0	f_4	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
13	A	0	1	1	1	1	1	1/2	1	1	1/2	0	f_4	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
14	A	0	1	1	1	1	1	3/2	1	1	1/2	0	f_4	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
15	A	0	1	1	1	2	1	3/2	2	1	1/2	0	f_4	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
16	A	1	1	0	0	0	1	1/2	0	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
17	A	1	1	0	1	1	1	1/2	1	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
18	A	1	1	0	1	1	1	3/2	1	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
19	A	1	1	0	2	2	1	3/2	2	0	1/2	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$
20	B	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_1
21	B	0	0	2	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	f_3	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_1
22	B	2	0	0	2	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	f_1	$\bar{\phi}$	$\bar{\phi}$	f_3

while in the CHH case, the functions $g_\alpha(r)$ have been taken equal to $\bar{\phi}(r)$, the latter function being chosen to be the solution of Eq. (C.1) with $\ell_\beta = 0$ and

$$V_{\beta,\beta'}(r) = \frac{1}{2} \left(V_S^{(c)}(r) + V_T^{(c)}(r) \right) \delta_{\beta\beta'} . \quad (\text{C.3})$$

Here $V_S^{(c)}(r)$ ($V_T^{(c)}(r)$) is the central part of the nuclear potential projected on the state 1S_0 (3S_1). At large interparticle distances, the correlation factors go to 1 in order to recover the HH expansion, which is well suited for describing such configurations.

Let us now consider the $A = 4$ case. The four-body correlation factors are given in term of the functions f_α , g_α and h_α in Eq. (85). The functions $f_\alpha(r_{ij})$ related to the reference pair (i, j) have been determined by using the same criteria as for the $A = 3$ case. The functions $g_\alpha(r_{ik})$ and $h_\alpha(r_{km})$ with k, m different from the reference pair indices i, j (see Eq. (85)) correlate pairs which are not in a definite angular-spin-isospin state. For simplicity reasons, for the channels constructed with the set A of the Jacobi vectors ($\alpha = 1 - 8$ and $12 - 19$, as listed in Table 2), we have chosen $g_\alpha = h_\alpha = \bar{\phi}$, where the function $\bar{\phi}$ has been calculated as in the $A = 3$ case, namely using the potential given in Eq. (C.3). Other choices for these functions have been proved not to influence

appreciably the final result.

The correlation functions of the channels constructed with the set B of the Jacobi vectors ($\alpha = 9 - 11$ and $20 - 22$) have been chosen in a similar way. In this case, the functions correlating pairs with definite angular-spin-isospin quantum numbers are f_α and h_α , and they have been chosen to be $\phi_{3_{S_1}}$ or $\phi_{3_{D_1}}$ depending on the value of ℓ_3 and ℓ_1 , respectively. The functions g_α have been chosen to be $\bar{\phi}$, as in the other channels. A summary of the correlation factors used in the various channels is given in Table C1.

Appendix D. The Matrix Elements of the Interaction in the HH Expansion

In this appendix, a more detailed discussion how to compute the matrix elements of the interaction between the basis functions $\Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi} f_l(\rho)$ of Eq. (77) is reported. The states $\Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi}$ are constructed in terms of the Jacobi vectors defined with permutation $p = 1$ and the standard choice of Jacobi vectors given in Eq. (5). In this case, the Jacobi vectors are specified in Eq. (5), namely

$$\mathbf{x}_N = \mathbf{r}_2 - \mathbf{r}_1, \quad \mathbf{x}_{N-1} = \sqrt{\frac{4}{3}} \left(\mathbf{r}_3 - \frac{\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2}{2} \right), \quad \dots \quad (\text{D.1})$$

Let us remember the general expression of the jj -coupling spin-isospin-HH states $\Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi} = & \left\{ \left[\left(Y_{\ell_N}(\hat{x}_N) S_2 \right)_{j_N} \left(Y_{\ell_{N-1}}(\hat{x}_{N-1}) S_3 \right)_{j_{N-1}} \right]_{J_{N-1}} \cdots \left(Y_{\ell_1}(\hat{x}_1) S_A \right)_{j_1} \right\}_{JJ_z} \\ & \times \left\{ \left[(T_2 t_3)_{T_3} t_4 \right]_{T_4} \cdots t_A \right\}_{TT_z}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where S_2 (T_2) is the spin (isospin) state of the particles 1 and 2, etc. Moreover, let us use the short-cut $\{T\} \equiv \{T_2, T_3, \dots, T_{A-1}, T_A\}$, where T_i is the total isospin of particles $1, \dots, i$ and $T_A \equiv T$. Let us consider first the matrix elements of the NN interaction, which in general is assumed to be non-local and non-isospin conserving. In configuration space, the matrix element in Eq. (99) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{G'T'\nu', GT\nu}^{J\pi} &= \langle \Xi_{\nu'}^{G'T'J\pi} | v(1, 2) | \Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi} \rangle \\ &= \int d^3\mathbf{x}_N d^3\mathbf{x}'_N d^3\mathbf{x}_{N-1} \cdots d^3\mathbf{x}_1 \left[\Xi_{\nu'}^{G'T'J\pi}(\Omega'_N) \right]^\dagger f_l(\rho') \\ &\quad \times V(\mathbf{x}'_N, \mathbf{x}_N) \Xi_\nu^{GTJ\pi}(\Omega_N) f_l(\rho), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.3})$$

where the dependence of V on the spin and isospin operators of particles 1 and 2 is understood. Above, Ω_N denotes the hyperangular variables constructed from $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N-1}, \mathbf{x}_N\}$ and Ω'_N those constructed from $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N-1}, \mathbf{x}'_N\}$. Moreover $\rho = \sqrt{x_1 + \dots + x_N^2}$ and $\rho' = \sqrt{x_1 + \dots + x_{N-1}^2 + (x'_N)^2}$. Note that V cannot change the total angular momentum j_N of particles 1, 2. Let us suppose to know

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\ell'_N S'_2, \ell_N S_2}^{j_N, \{T'\}, \{T\}}(x'_N, x_N) &= \int d\hat{x}'_N d\hat{x}_N \left(Y_{\ell'_N}(\hat{x}'_N) S'_2 \right)_{j_N}^\dagger \left\{ \left[(T'_2 t_3)_{T'_3} t_4 \right]_{T'_4} \cdots t_A \right\}_{T'T_z}^\dagger \\ &\quad \times V(\mathbf{x}'_N, \mathbf{x}_N) \end{aligned}$$

$$\times \left(Y_{\ell_N}(\hat{x}_N) S_2 \right)_{j_N} \left\{ \left[(T_2 t_3)_{T_3} t_4 \right]_{T_4} \cdots t_A \right\}_{TT_z}, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

which is usually quite easy to obtain.

The integration over $d^3\mathbf{x}_{N-1} \cdots d^3\mathbf{x}_1$ is easily performed applying the properties of the HH function. First of all, the hyperspherical angles $\varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{N-1}$ do not depend on x_N , and therefore are the same for both Ω_N and Ω'_N . Second, it results that

$$d^3\mathbf{x}_{N-1} \cdots d^3\mathbf{x}_1 = (\rho_{N-1})^{D-4} d\rho_{N-1} d\Omega_{N-1}, \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where $\Omega_{N-1} \equiv \{\hat{x}_1, \dots, \hat{x}_{N-1}, \varphi_2, \dots, \varphi_{N-1}\}$ are the hyperspherical coordinates related to the Jacobi vectors $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{N-1}\}$ and

$$\rho_{N-1} = \sqrt{x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{N-1}^2}. \quad (\text{D.6})$$

Third, $\mathbf{x}_N$ ($\mathbf{x}'_N$) depends only on ρ and φ_N (ρ' and φ'_N) and hence V does not depend on the Ω_{N-1} variables. Therefore, we can integrate over $d\Omega_{N-1}$ and use the orthonormality relation of Eq. (32). Also the traces over the spin variables of particles 3, $\dots$, A can be easily computed, and the final results is:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{G'T'\nu', GT\nu}^{J\pi} &= \int x_N^2 dx_N (x'_N)^2 dx'_N (\rho_{N-1})^{D-4} d\rho_{N-1} \\ &\times {}^{(N)}\mathcal{P}_{n'_N}^{G_{N-1}, \ell'_N}(\varphi'_N) f_{\nu'}(\rho') V_{\ell'_N S'_2, \ell_N S_2}^{j_N, \{T'\}, \{T\}}(x'_N, x_N) \\ &\times {}^{(N)}\mathcal{P}_{n_N}^{G_{N-1}, \ell_N}(\varphi_N) f_l(\rho) \\ &\times \delta_{j_N, j'_N} \cdots \delta_{j_1, j'_1} \delta_{J_{N-1}, J'_{N-1}} \cdots \delta_{J_2, J'_2} \\ &\times \delta_{\ell_{N-1}, \ell'_{N-1}} \cdots \delta_{\ell_1, \ell'_1} \delta_{n_{N-1}, n'_{N-1}} \cdots \delta_{n_2, n'_2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.7})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho^2 &= x_N^2 + \rho_{N-1}^2, \quad (\rho')^2 = (x'_N)^2 + \rho_{N-1}^2, \\ \cos \varphi_N &= x_N / \rho, \quad \cos \varphi'_N = x'_N / \rho', \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.8})$$

and G_{N-1} is given by Eq. (30). Finally, the three-dimensional integrations involved in Eq. (D.7) can be accurately performed with standard numerical techniques (Gauss integration) [82]. For local potentials, the functions $V(x'_N, x_N)$ reduces to $V(x_N) \delta(x'_N - x_N) / x_N^2$.

For the 3N interaction $W \equiv W(\mathbf{x}'_N, \mathbf{x}'_{N-1}, \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{x}_{N-1})$, the first step is to know the projection over three-body angular-spin states, namely

$$\begin{aligned} W_{\ell'_N S'_2 j'_N \ell'_{N-1} j'_{N-1} \ell_N S_2 j_N \ell_{N-1} j_{N-1}}^{J_{N-1}, \{T'\}, \{T\}}(x'_N, x'_{N-1}, x_N, x_{N-1}) &= \\ &\int d\hat{x}'_N d\hat{x}_N d\hat{x}'_{N-1} d\hat{x}_{N-1} \left[\left(Y_{\ell'_N}(\hat{x}'_N) S'_2 \right)_{j'_N} \left(Y_{\ell'_{N-1}}(\hat{x}'_{N-1}) s_3 \right)_{j'_{N-1}} \right]_{J_{N-1}}^\dagger \\ &\times \left\{ \left[(T'_2 t_3)_{T'_3} t_4 \right]_{T'_4} \cdots t_A \right\}_{T'T_z}^\dagger W(\mathbf{x}'_N, \mathbf{x}'_{N-1}, \mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{x}_{N-1}) \\ &\times \left[\left(Y_{\ell_N}(\hat{x}_N) S_2 \right)_{j_N} \left(Y_{\ell_{N-1}}(\hat{x}_{N-1}) s_3 \right)_{j_{N-1}} \right]_{J_{N-1}} \\ &\times \left\{ \left[(T_2 t_3)_{T_3} t_4 \right]_{T_4} \cdots t_A \right\}_{TT_z}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.9})$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& < \Xi_{\nu'}^{G'T'J\pi} | W | \Xi_{\nu}^{GTJ\pi} > = \\
& \int x_N^2 dx_N x_{N-1}^2 dx_{N-1} (x'_N)^2 dx'_N (x'_{N-1})^2 dx'_{N-1} (\rho_{N-2})^{D-7} d\rho_{N-2} \\
& \times {}^{(N)}\mathcal{P}_{n'_N}^{G'_{N-1}, \ell'_N}(\varphi'_N) {}^{(N-1)}\mathcal{P}_{n'_{N-1}}^{G_{N-2}, \ell'_{N-1}}(\varphi'_{N-1}) f_{l'}(\rho') \\
& \times W_{\ell'_N S'_2 j'_N \ell'_{N-1} j'_{N-1}, \ell_N S_2 j_N \ell_{N-1} j_{N-1}}^{J_{N-1}, \{T'\}, \{T\}}(x'_N, x'_{N-1}, x_N, x_{N-1}) \\
& \times {}^{(N)}\mathcal{P}_{n_N}^{G_{N-1}, \ell_N}(\varphi_N) {}^{(N-1)}\mathcal{P}_{n_{N-1}}^{G_{N-2}, \ell_{N-1}}(\varphi_{N-1}) f_l(\rho) \\
& \times \delta_{j_{N-2}, j'_{N-2}} \cdots \delta_{j_1, j'_1} \delta_{J_{N-1}, J'_{N-1}} \cdots \delta_{J_2, J'_2} \\
& \times \delta_{\ell_{N-2}, \ell'_{N-2}} \cdots \delta_{\ell_1, \ell'_1} \delta_{n_{N-2}, n'_{N-2}} \cdots \delta_{n_2, n'_2} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho^2 &= x_N^2 + x_{N-1}^2 + \rho_{N-2}^2 , \quad \cos \varphi_N = x_N / \rho , \\
\cos \varphi_{N-1} &= x_{N-1} / \sqrt{x_{N-1}^2 + \rho_{N-2}^2} ,
\end{aligned} \tag{D.11}$$

and analogously for the primed quantities. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
G_{N-2} &= \sum_{i=1}^{N-2} (\ell_i + 2n_i) , \\
G_{N-1} &= \ell_{N-1} + 2n_{N-1} + G_{N-2} , \\
G'_{N-1} &= \ell'_{N-1} + 2n'_{N-1} + G_{N-2} .
\end{aligned} \tag{D.12}$$

For momentum-space potentials, similar results are obtained, with the only change $\mathbf{x}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{q}_i$, $\rho \rightarrow Q$, $f_l(\rho) \rightarrow g_{l,G}(Q)$.

Acknowledgments

This work was partially supported by the Italian *Ministero dell'Università e della Ricerca*.

References

- [1] H. Yukawa, Proc. Phys. Math. Soc. Japan **17**, 48 (1935)
- [2] K.A. Brueckner and K.M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **90**, 699 (1953)
- [3] K.A. Brueckner and K.M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **92**, 1023 (1953)
- [4] T. Hamada and I.D. Johnston, Nucl. Phys. **34**, 382 (1962)
- [5] R.V. Reid, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **50**, 411 (1968)
- [6] W.N. Cottingham *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 800 (1973)
- [7] M.M. Nagels, T.A. Rijken, and J.J. de Swart, Phys. Rev. **D17**, 768 (1978)
- [8] R. Machleidt, K. Holinde, and Ch. Elster, Phys. Rep. **149**, 1 (1987)
- [9] V.G.J. Stoks *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C49**, 2950 (1994)
- [10] R.B. Wiringa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C51**, 38 (1995)
- [11] R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C63**, 024001 (2001)
- [12] J. Fujita and H. Miyazawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **17**, 360 (1957)
- [13] R.B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. **C41**, 1585 (1991)

- [14] B.S. Pudliner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4396 (1995)
- [15] S.C. Pieper *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C64**, 014001 (2001)
- [16] S.A. Coon *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A317**, 242 (1979); S.A. Coon and W. Glöckle, Phys. Rev. **C23**, 1790 (1981)
- [17] J.L. Friar, D. Hüber, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. **C59**, 53 (1999)
- [18] S.A. Coon and H.K. Han, Few-Body Syst. **30**, 131 (2001)
- [19] H.T. Coelho, T.K. Das, and M.R. Robilotta, Phys. Rev. **C28**, 1812 (1983); M.R. Robilotta and H.T. Coelho, Nucl. Phys. **A460**, 645 (1986)
- [20] S. Weinberg, Physica A **96**, 327 (1979)
- [21] S. Weinberg, Phys. Lett. **B251**, 288 (1990)
- [22] C. Ordóñez, L. Ray, and U. van Kolck, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 1982 (1994); Phys. Rev. **C53**, 2086 (1996)
- [23] U. van Kolck, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. **43**, 337 (1999)
- [24] N. Kaiser, R. Brockmann, and W. Weise, Nucl. Phys. **A625**, 758 (1997), and references therein
- [25] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, and Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A637**, 107 (1998)
- [26] E. Epelbaum, W. Glöckle, and Ulf-G. Meißner, Nucl. Phys. **A671**, 295 (2000)
- [27] E. Epelbaum, Progr. Part. Nucl. Phys. **57**, 654 (2006), and references therein
- [28] D.R. Entem and R. Machleidt, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 041001 (2003)
- [29] S.K. Bogner *et al.*, nucl-th/0111042
- [30] S.K. Bogner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C65**, 051301(R) (2002)
- [31] S.K. Bogner *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B576**, 265 (2003)
- [32] S.K. Bogner, T.T.S. Kuo, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rep. **386**, 1 (2003)
- [33] A. Schwenk, J. Phys. **G31**, S1273 (2005)
- [34] S.K. Bogner *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **A784**, 79 (2007)
- [35] A. Nogga, S.K. Bogner, and A. Schwenk, Phys. Rev. **C70**, 061002(R) (2004)
- [36] L.D. Faddeev, Zh. Eksperim. i Teor. Fiz. **39**, 1459 (1960) [Sov. Phys. JETP **12**, 1014 (1961); *Mathematical Aspects of the Three-Body Problems in the Quantum Scattering Theory*, translated from Russian, the Israel Program for Scientific translations, Jerusalem (D. Davey and Company, New York, 1965)]
- [37] W. Glöckle *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **274**, 107 (1996)
- [38] O.A. Yakubovsky, Yad. Fiz. **5**, 1312 (1967), and Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **5**, 937 (1967)
- [39] R. Lazauskas and J. Carbonell, Phys. Rev. **C70**, 044002 (2004)
- [40] A. Nogga, H. Kamada, and W. Glöckle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 944 (2000)
- [41] A. Deltuva, R. Machleidt, and P. Sauer, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 024005 (2003)
- [42] A. Deltuva, A.C. Fonseca, and P. Sauer, Phys. Rev. **C71**, 054005 (2005)
- [43] W. Kohn, Phys. Rev. **74**, 1763 (1948)
- [44] R.B. Wiringa *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **B143**, 273 (1984)
- [45] B.S. Pudliner *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C56**, 1720 (1997)
- [46] R.B. Wiringa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C62**, 014001 (2000)
- [47] S.C. Pieper, K. Varga, and R.B. Wiringa, Phys. Rev. **C66**, 044310 (2002)
- [48] M. Kamimura, Phys. Rev. **A38**, 621 (1988)
- [49] M. Kamimura and H. Kameyama, Nucl. Phys. **A508**, 17 (1990)
- [50] Y. Suzuki and K. Varga, *Stochastic Variational Approach to Quantum-Mechanical Few-Body Problems* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1998)
- [51] J. Usukura, Y. Suzuki, and K. Varga, Phys. Rev. **B59**, 5652 (1999)
- [52] P. Navrátil and B.R. Barrett, Phys. Rev. **C59**, 1906 (1999)
- [53] P. Navrátil, J.P. Vary, and B.R. Barrett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5728 (2000)
- [54] P. Navrátil and E. Caurier, Phys. Rev. **C69**, 014311 (2004)
- [55] E. Caurier and P. Navrátil, Phys. Rev. **C73**, 021302(R) (2006)
- [56] P. Navrátil *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 042501 (2007)
- [57] K. Suzuki and S.Y. Lee, Prog. Theor. Phys. **64**, 2091 (1980)

- [58] M. Fabre de la Ripelle, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **147**, 281 (1983)
- [59] J. Avery, *Hyperspherical Harmonics. Applications in Quantum Theory.* (Kluwer Academic Publishers Group, Dordrecht, 1989)
- [60] N. Barnea, W. Leidemann, and G. Orlandini, *Nucl. Phys.* **A650**, 427 (1999)
- [61] A. Kievsky, M. Viviani, and S. Rosati, *Nucl. Phys.* **A551**, 241 (1993)
- [62] A. Kievsky, S. Rosati, and M. Viviani, *Nucl. Phys.* **A577**, 511 (1994)
- [63] M. Viviani, A. Kievsky, and S. Rosati, *Few-Body Syst.* **18**, 25 (1995)
- [64] A. Kievsky *et al.*, *Few-Body Syst.* **22**, 1 (1997)
- [65] M. Viviani, A. Kievsky, and S. Rosati, *Phys. Rev.* **C71**, 024006 (2005)
- [66] H. Kamada *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C64**, 044001 (2001)
- [67] M. Viviani *et al.*, *Few-Body Syst.* **39**, 159 (2006)
- [68] M. Viviani *et al.*, *Nucl. Phys.* **A790**, 46 (2007)
- [69] A. Kievsky, M. Viviani, and S. Rosati, *Phys. Rev.* **C52**, 15 (1995)
- [70] A. Kievsky, M. Viviani, and S. Rosati, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 3759 (1999)
- [71] A. Kievsky, *Nucl. Phys.* **A624**, 125 (1997)
- [72] M. Viviani, S. Rosati, and A. Kievsky, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 1580 (1998)
- [73] A. Kievsky, M. Viviani, and S. Rosati, *Phys. Rev.* **C64**, 024002 (2001)
- [74] A. Kievsky, M. Viviani, and L.E. Marcucci, *Phys. Rev.* **C69**, 014002 (2004)
- [75] A. Kievsky *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C58**, 3085 (1998)
- [76] A. Kievsky *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C63**, 064004 (2001)
- [77] M. Viviani *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C61**, 064001 (2000)
- [78] L.E. Marcucci *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 5959 (2000); *Phys. Rev.* **C63**, 015801 (2001)
- [79] T.-S. Park *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C67**, 055206 (2003)
- [80] L.E. Marcucci *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C72**, 014001 (2005)
- [81] F. Zernike and H.C. Brinkman, *Proc. Kon. Ned. Acad. Wensch.* **33**, 3 (1935)
- [82] M. Abramowitz and I. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1970)
- [83] V.D. Efros, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **15**, 128 (1972)
- [84] V.F. Demin, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **26**, 379 (1977)
- [85] M. Viviani, *Few-Body Syst.* **25**, 177 (1998)
- [86] J. Raynal and J. Revai, *Nuovo Cim.* **68**, 612 (1970)
- [87] H. Kameyama, M. Kamimura, and Y. Fukushima, *Phys. Rev.* **C40**, 974 (1989)
- [88] C.R. Chen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C31**, 2266 (1985)
- [89] J.L. Friar, B.F. Gibson, and G.L. Payne, *Phys. Rev.* **C36**, 1138 (1987)
- [90] S. Ishikawa *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 1877 (1984)
- [91] T. Sasakawa and S. Ishikawa, *Few-Body Syst.* **1**, 3 (1986)
- [92] S. Rosati, M. Viviani, and A. Kievsky, *Few-Body Syst.* **9**, 1 (1990)
- [93] C.R. Chen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev.* **C39**, 1261 (1989)
- [94] A.B. Volkov, *Nucl. Phys.* **74**, 33 (1965)
- [95] L.R. Afnan and Y.C. Tang, *Phys. Rev.* **175**, 1337 (1968)
- [96] D.R. Thompson, M. LeMere, and Y.C. Tang, *Nucl. Phys.* **A286**, 53 (1977)
- [97] R.A. Malfliet and J.A. Tjon, *Nucl. Phys.* **A127**, 161 (1969)
- [98] K. Varga and Y. Suzuki, *Phys. Rev.* **C52**, 2885 (1995)
- [99] N.W. Schellingerhout, J.J. Schut, and L.P. Kok, *Phys. Rev.* **C46**, 1192 (1992)
- [100] N. Barnea, W. Leidemann, and G. Orlandini, *Phys. Rev.* **C61**, 054001 (2000); *Phys. Rev.* **C67**, 054003 (2003)
- [101] Y. Akaishi, *International Review of Nuclear Physics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1986), Vol. 4, p. 259
- [102] G. Erens, J.L. Visschers, and R. van Wageningen, *Ann. Phys. (N.Y.)* **67**, 461 (1971)
- [103] J.L. Ballot, *Z. Phys.* **A302**, 347 (1981)
- [104] R.B. Wiringa, R.A. Smith, and T.L. Ainsworth, *Phys. Rev.* **C29**, 1207 (1984)

- [105] P. Doleschall and I. Borbély, Phys. Rev. **C62**, 054004 (2000); P. Doleschall *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C64**, 064005 (2003)
- [106] P. Doleschall, Phys. Rev. **C77**, 034002 (2008)
- [107] A. Nogga *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C65**, 054003 (2002)
- [108] A. Nogga *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C67**, 034004 (2003)
- [109] P. Navrátil, Few-Body Syst. **41**, 117 (2007)
- [110] A. Deltuva, A.C. Fonseca, and P.U. Sauer, Phys. Rev. **C73**, 057001 (2006)
- [111] A. Deltuva and A.C. Fonseca, Phys. Rev. **C75**, 014005 (2007)
- [112] A. Nogga, private communications
- [113] D.H. Beck and R.D. McKeown, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **51**, 189 (2001)
- [114] S. Ramavataram, E. Hadjimichael, and T.W. Donnelly, Phys. Rev. **C50**, 1175 (1994)
- [115] A. Acha *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 032301 (2007)
- [116] M. Viviani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 112002 (2007)
- [117] E. J. Stephenson *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 142302 (2003)
- [118] A. Gardestig *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C69**, 044606 (2004)
- [119] C.R. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C44**, 50 (1991)
- [120] H. Witała *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C68**, 034002 (2003)
- [121] W. Dilg, L. Koester, and W. Nistler, Phys. Lett. **36B**, 208 (1971)
- [122] K. Schoen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C67**, 044005 (2003)
- [123] A.C. Phillips, Nucl. Phys. **A107**, 209 (1968); Rep. Prog. Phys. **40**, 905 (1977)
- [124] H. Rauch *et al.*, Phys. Lett. **165B**, 39 (1985)
- [125] G.M. Hale *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **C42**, 438 (1990)
- [126] M.T. Alley and L.D. Knutson, Phys. Rev. **C48**, 1901 (1993)
- [127] P.E. Tegnér and C. Bargholtz, Astrophys. J. **272**, 311 (1983)
- [128] T.W. Phillips, B.L. Berman, and J.D. Seagrave, Phys. Rev. **C22**, 384 (1980)
- [129] V.D. Efros, Few-Body Syst. **19**, 167 (1995)
- [130] L. Bracci, S. Rosati, and M. Viviani, in *Perspectives on Theoretical Nuclear Physics*, edited by L. Bracci *et al.*, (ETS Editrice, Pisa 1987), p. 34